FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 226 24 November 1986

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Arbatov Statement on SDI, U.S. Policies Reported AA 1
[Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO 17 Nov]
Budapest TV Interviews Karpov on Arms Talks AA 3
Bloc 'Striving' to Consolidate Reykjavik Results AA 5
[Shishlin]

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Moscow Conference Discusses CEMA Cooperation BB 1
[Kamorin in IZVESTIYA 20 Nov]
Sofia Communique on CEMA Communications Meeting BB 1
CEMA Nuclear Forum Discusses Building Program BB 2
Delegate Views Nuclear Session BB 2
[Popowski, PAP]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Shevardnadze Said To Propose Links With EEC [AFP] CC 1
Petrovskiy Press Conference on U.S. 'Duplicity' CC 1
[IZVESTIYA 23 Nov]
'Virus' of Misinformation CC 4
Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 5
[Charikov, Antsiferov, Tsoppi]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Commentaries Condemn U.S. Reykjavik Stance A 1
Reagan 'Distorted' Discussions [Bogachev] A 1
Tolkunov Hits Shultz 'Revision' [PRAVDA 24 Nov] A 2
Shishlin Condemns Reagan-Thatcher SDI Alliance A 3
Continuing Reportage of Iran Arms Controversy A 4
Criticism Intensifies A 4
Casey Briefing Viewed A 5
Sales Show U.S. 'Hegemony' [Korshunov] A 5
'Top Priority' on 'Irangate' [Pozner, Bogdanov, Plekhanov] A 6
Program On Democratic Senate Gains [Seyful-Mulyukov] A 10
TASS Examines Reagan's Remarks on Religion [Krasikov] A 11
Reagan Meets With Haitian Leader 21 Nov [Ignatyev] A 12

NORTHEAST ASIA

DPRK Meeting Adopts Letter on U.S. 'Intrigues' C 1
Asian Specialist on U.S. Policy in Korea C 1
Economist Speaks on Asian-Pacific Cooperation C 2

SOUTH ASIA

Gorbachev Interviewed by Indian Journalists D 1
Reportage on Gorbachev Departure for India D 10
Preparatory Group Briefs Press D 10
[Baydashin, Belikov, Kotov, Shishkin]
Gorbachev, Delegation Depart D 12

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

TASS Issues Warning on Planned Pacific Tests E 1
PRAVDA Reports Aliyev Meetings in Vientiane [16 Nov] E 1
PRAVDA Links U.S. With Philippines 'Discord' E 2
[Ovchinnikov 17 Nov]

EASTERN EUROPE

Romanian Envoy, Ion Received by Officials F 1
Holds Talks With Gromyko F 1
Received by Medvedev F 1
Kapitonov-Led Delegation Departs For Bucharest F 1
Seen Off by Medvedev F 1
Arrives in Bucharest F 1
Vorotnikov Receives Yugoslav Ambassador F 2
BCP Politburo Assessment of Moscow Talks Cited F 2
[IZVESTIYA 16 Nov]
Bulgarian Army Political Chief Honored [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Nov] F 3
All-Union Amity With PR Meeting Held in Moscow [Warsaw] F 3
Jaruzelski Discusses Relations With USSR F 3
[cross-reference]

WESTERN EUROPE

Further Reportage on Visit of Netherlands' Leader G 1
Received by Ryzhkov G 1
Shevardnadze Meets Minister G 1
Murakhovskiy Meets Businessmen G 1

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Israeli Armed Forces Put on Combat Alert H 1
U.S.-Iran Contacts Seek 'Base, Selfish' Motives H 1
[Korionov in PRAVDA 20 Nov]
Khomeyni Criticizes Reagan Press Conference H 2
Iraq's Ramadan Receives Friendship Delegation H 2
[IZVESTIYA 18 Nov]

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Hasenfus Convicted, U.S. Continues 'Dirty War' [Yevdokomiv] K 1
Nicaraguan Spokesman Praises Support Statement K 1
Nicaraguan Assembly Adopts New Constitution [Trushin] K 2

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Press Conference Held on Supreme Soviet Session R 1
[Talyzin, Gostev, Gladkiy]
TASS Analyst Examines Individual Labor Law R 6
[Prokhorov]
Academician on Law [Abalkin] R 7
PRAVDA's Afanasyev Answers Questions on Reform R 8

ARBATOV STATEMENT ON SDI, U.S. POLICIES REPORTED

AU211421 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 17 Nov 86

[Statement by Academician Georgiy Arbatov, director of the United States and Canada Institute, Moscow, to newspaper's Moscow correspondent Dimitur Gornenski; first part of 3-part report: "Eminent Soviet Scholars for RABOTNICHESKO DELO: Questions Posed by the Unconstructive Policy of the United States" -- first paragraph is Gornenski's introduction; passages within slantlines in bold face]

[Text] Moscow, 16 November (from RABOTNICHESKO DELO correspondent Dimitur Gornenski) -- Soviet political and scientific observers continue to comment on the outcome of the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Iceland's capital. During the month since the meeting they have had time and received new facts to make an analysis both of the results of the dialogue and its effects on the world political climate. The observer's stastements analyze the reasons for the negative outcome of the Reykjavik negotiations and the bankruptcy of the U.S. position. A very full picture of these reasons is given by the conclusions of three Soviet scholars, Academician Georgiy Arbatov, Academician Vsevolod Avduyevskiy, and Professor Dr Georgiy Tsagolov, which we will be publishing over the next few days.

Academician Georgiy Arbatov [heading]

1. The Political Motives for the White House Rejection of Integrated Agreements [subhead]

2. One of the issues related to the Reykjavik meeting which has aroused especially intense interest among the world public is this: Why did the United States and the USSR fail to achieve a historic agreement delivering mankind from the nuclear threat? Was it due to the fact that they could not agree on the Star Wars issue? Or are there more serious, more profound reasons?

Thus the main question is: if the version is not confirmed that no agreements were achieved in the Icelandic capital due to individual, even technical differences, then what in fact was the true reason? It is my view that /the present U.S. Administration had not proved ready to reach accords on eliminating the threat of nuclear war./ And perhaps it did not want such accords at all.

It is difficult, after serious consideration, to adopt the very formulation of the issue that no accord was reached solely because of, and in relation to SDI because SDI, however much it may be unfeasible illusion, is nonetheless not an exceptional case. It is a concentrated expression of a definite policy, one which incompatible with nuclear disarmament and security.

This is so first and foremost because /SDI is an attempt to guarantee one's own security by means of weapons and military hardware./ And this had never led to disarmament and peace, but only to the arms race and war.

Furthermore, /SDI is an attempt to guarantee security for its own sake, while placing the security of other states under threat./ And one-sided security in our times is simply impossible. Our two states can survive or perish only together.

Finally, /SDI is an attempt nonetheless to find a method of waging nuclear war and or attaining victory in such a war,/despite all the solemn declarations of the U.S. President that he does wish to consider either of the two possible.

All these contrdictions in the present policy of the United States, the contrast between the words and deeds of the Washington administration, were illuminated at Reykjavik with maximum clarity. Because, let us say, if nuclear weapons are eliminated over a 10-year period, then why should a great cause have to be sacrificed from a weapons system for which no target will exist in 10 years time, namely ballistic missiles?

The U.S. President's explanations on this question were extremely unconvincing. To Mikhail Gorbachev he mentioned something about a madman who might in some way suddenly get hold of a few nuclear charges and blackmail the whole world with them. But is it really possible for a madman to get possession of an intercontinental ballistic missile? SDI is suitable only for actions against such missiles. It will be powerless against cruise missile or an aircraft, and even more against a "saboteur" carrying a nuclear bomb in his suitcase.

On his return to the United States, the President displayed greater frankness. There he talks not about an anonymous "madman," but about the Russians. It is precisely the Russians -- "because one cannot trust them" -- who are able to conceal several weapons, and then it will be bad for the United States. The President cannot agree to leave the American people without protection (that is, without the SDI). Amazing "logic." First, because would it be possible for anyone to conceal intercontinental ballistic missiles (given the existence of the strictest control measures!). Second, because in what way in essence can the U.S. President protect the American people from nuclear attack? There is no way, either now or in the foreseeable future. This is being pointed out to him by the U.S. critics -- that even after 10 years SDI will not have progressed beyond the experimental stage. The only way for the American people to be protected against the nuclear threat remains the destruction of nuclear weapons. This was indeed proposed by the Soviet Union in Reykjavik, but was rejected by the U.S. President, because of the "Star Wars" chimera. And third, if the President is so distrustful of the Russians and expects that they will dupe the United States even with all possible methods of control, then why did he come to Reykjavik, and why did he agree to negotiate with the USSR on reducing weapons? We will not raise the question at all of whether such suspiciousness is justified or not. Eloquent evidence is offered by the very fact that in his explanations and in convincing the Americans of the need for SDI, the President revealed the essence of this position. /It turned out that he has conducted negotiations with no intention of concluding an agreement./

This also makes clear the position of the U.S. Administration on its attitude to the existing treaties -- for limiting strategic weapons, for antimissile defense, and so on. The Administration does not need them, they only restrict its actions. It is the same as when it has no need of the international organizations -- from the International Court to USESCO and the United Nations. This is logical -- once the Administration places reliance on force, on arms, on military hardware, then international law becomes a burden and there only remains room for the law of the first.

/Recently eyewitnesses quoted the words of an anonymous highly placed U.S. figure: "Thank God that the President didn't sign anything in Reykjavik!" All right, but what if he had signed something? In such an event, would not the U.S. governing circles deal with this agreement of the administration in exactly the same way as the /Administration is preparing to act in relation to the treaties for limiting strategic weapons and for antimissile defense?/

BUDAPEST TV INTERVIEWS KARPOV ON ARMS TALKS

LD232226 Budapest Television Service in Hungarian 1800 GMT 23 Nov 86

[From "The Week" program; interview with Viktor Karpov, chief of a USSR Foreign Ministry department, by correspondent Alajos Chrudinak; date and place not given -- Karpov's remarks in Russian with superimposed Hungarian translation; recorded]

[Text] [Chrudinak] How do you, as head of the Soviet delegation at the Geneva talks, see the reasons for your traveling to Geneva in early December to conduct a round of unscheduled talks for a week with the Americans? What are the objectives?

[Karpov] These are not unscheduled talks, but another attempt to take stock, nevertheless, of what we have achieved in the talks so far and to determine where we stand at the moment, before the seventh round of talks starting in January.

[Chrudinak] But General Secretary Gorbachev has himself stated that nothing has happened in Geneva in the last 2 years, and that you merely waged a war of numbers. I have interviewed Professor Arbatov, who has also said that in his view the problems will not be solved in Geneva. All the important decisions, in his opinion, will be made in the two capitals, Moscow and Washington, and that the Geneva talks deal only with minor matters, details. What is your opinion of this?

[Karpov] I would not say that the tasks we have now been assigned are trifling. So I do not agree with Comrade Arbatov on this point. But he is right when he says that questions of fundamental importance will be decided in the capitals. This is only natural. At the same time, unlike the situation that characterized Geneva before Reykjavik, there are some very serious new Soviet proposals in Geneva now. In our view these proposals are such, that if the U.S. side were to approve them they would achieve a breakthrough in nuclear disarmament,and we could take a step forward toward a real nuclear-free world. This is where the difference lies in comparison to the things we did in Geneva before Reykjavik, and because of which we were criticized -- quite correctly, in my view -- by Mikhail Gorbachev, who said that all we had managed to cook up with Mr Kampelman in all that time was a tasteless stew.

[Chrudinak] This implies that progress can be made in the near future only on the basis of the Reykjavik agreement, if you manage to agree on what happened there, and when you finally agree on what you agreed in Reykjavik?

[Karpov] Unfortunately negotiations are not a one-way street where one can reach one's exact destination. Here there is also oncoming traffic, on the part of our partner, the other participant in the talks. Unfortunately, at present we are moving along different routes. We, for your part, are treading the road marked out in Reykjavik: the road of nuclear disarmament. The U.S. delegation, on the other hand, the U.S. side attending the talks, has changed course. We are now doing our utmost to usher them toward the road we marked out in Reykjavik. But the U.S. side is resisting, and is trying to deviate from this course.

[Chrudinak] So you are saying that the main reason for failure at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Reykjavik is that Washington does not want to place restructions on the testing of space weapons and does not want to alter its Star Wars program. Was this the fundamental reason?

[Karpov] Yes, this was the fundamental reason. The fundamental reason for the failure was that the Star Wars program has apparently become a sort of sacred cow for the Reagan administration.

[Chrudinak] But you also made some concessions, in the continuation of laboratory tests. What in your view do the terms laboratory and laboratory experiments mean?

[Karpov] This question remains to be discussed. The two sides must compare their interpretations of this concept.

[Chrudinak] Look, I do not want to make guesses at this point about what these laboratories should be like. This is up to the experts. They have to sit down opposite each other and determine what is a laboratory, what is a laboratory test, and what can be regarded as tests outside the laboratory. I am not an expert in these technical matters, so I shall not even attempt to define these things.

[Chrudinak] I am not an expert either, but General Secretary Gorbachev's statements on this have led me to deduce that you are opposed primarily to tests carried out in space.

[Karpov] This is perfectly true. We have clearly stated this. We are opposed to the testing in space of all the elements of antiballistic space-based missiles systems.

[Chrudinak] So some sort of compromise is possible here?

[Karpov] We have not even discussed this question, so it is too early to talk of compromise. For the moment it must be determined what the two sides think of it. The U.S. side simply avoids discussing these questions.

[Chrudinak] What concessions do you, as head of the Soviet delegation, expect? What necessary concessions do you expect of the United States?

[Karpov] We expect the United States....

[Chrudinak, interrupting] What would be the most important concessions?

[Karpov] First and foremost a recognition of what we agreed in Reykjavik. This is the most important, because that is where we decided...

[Chrudinak, interrupting] But that is no concession.

[Karpov] This is exactly what I am trying to say, that is, that the achievement of Reykjavik, the things agreed, or those we nearly agreed, were a package of mutual concessions. If the United States were to restrict the SDI space program exclusively to laboratory tests and research, this would be for us the Americans' most important concession.

[Chrudinak] Can these questions, the four big arms limitations questions, be solved separately, or only together as a package? Some people say that the USSR launched its all-or-nothing negotiating policy in Reykjavik. So do you think that some individual issues can be solved separately?

[Karpov] The situation is that -- as I have already said -- a package of proposals came together in Reykjavik whose components balance each other. This is the balance of interests, the balance of mutual concessions. So within the framework of the Reykjavik package the issues must be solved together. In this balanced group the sole component which can be solved separately from the group -- and the sooner it is done the better -- is the ending of nuclear weapons tests. Here we are prepared to reach agreement at this very moment, separately from all other aspects.

[Chrudinak] Separately?

[Karpov] Separately. As for the other parts of this range of issues, they must be settled together.

[Chrudinak] And the Euromissiles, the medium-range missiles?

[Karpov] We have two options for settling this matter. One of them offers a solution separately from the others, and this proposal of ours continues to be valid. We proposed this solution last January within the framework of the program on the elimination of nuclear weapons until the year 2000. So this proposal is also on the negotiating table. If the West prefers this, we are prepared to settle the issue on this basis. But we also proposed another option in Reykjavik. This is part of the package. Should the West prefer this, well, gentlemen, let us discuss it and settle the matter accordingly.

BLOC 'STRIVING' TO CONSOLIDATE REYKJAVIK RESULTS

LD240058 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 23 Nov 86

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Nikolay Shishlin]

[Excerpts] Hello comrades! This last week, just like every other week in contemporary international life, has not been deprived of its fair share of events, nor of notable events. Well, I would like to say that events are important not in themselves, but, of course, in the political charge which these events carry. And in evaluating from this point of view the actions of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries after Reykjavik, it can definitely be said that our countries have been striving to consolidate the results of Reykjavik, to give new impetus to those possible accords and to give new breath to the dialogue which took shape in the Icelandic capital.

Briefly the aspiration of the socialist countries, and their actions, are aimed at preventing stagnation in international life. It is precisely for this reason that the Soviet Union is submitting at the Vienna meeting, where work is currently continuing, a broad constructive program directed at filling the Helsinki process, or, as it is still called, the common European process, with new and rich content. It is precisely for this reason that at the talks in Geneva the Soviet Union has tabled many-sided proposals on nuclear and space weapons which are mutually coordinated, and which are aimed at a 50 percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons and then their total elimination, and at the elimination of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, proposals which provide for a strengthening of the provisions of the ABM Treaty, and, of course, restricting to just laboratory research and testing of the U.S. Star Wars program. [passage omitted]

In a word, in European political life, and not only in European political life, there is the persistent and visible presence of the idea of the need to develop cooperation among states with different social systems.

MOSCOW CONFERENCE DISCUSSES CEMA COOPERATION

PM231356 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 8

[A. Kamorin report: "Urgent Problems of Cooperation"]

[Text] An international scientific conference -- "New Tasks and Problems of Cooperation Among the CEMA Countries in the Light of the Decisions of the Fraternal Parties Congresses" -- has been held in Moscow. The conference was pegged to the 25th anniversary of the setting up of its organizer -- the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System. CEMA Secretary V.V. Sychev, representatives of Soviet ministries and departments, and scientists from fraternal countries greeted the institute.

The conference participants discussed ways to solve urgent problems of acceleration of scientific and technical progress in the socialist countries and the intensification of their mutual cooperation. The tone of the discussion was set by the reports by Academician O.T. Bogomolov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System, and Yu. S. Shiryayev, director of the International Institute of Economic Problems of the World Socialist System and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

SOFIA COMMUNIQUE ON CEMA COMMUNICATIONS MEETING

LD220004 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1735 GMT 21 Nov 86

["Communique on the Session of the CEMA Standing Commission" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Sofia, 21 Nov (TASS) -- The latest session of the CEMA Standing Commission on Cooperation in the Sphere of Electric and Postal Communications has been held here. Taking part in it were delegations from Bulgaria, Hungary, SRV, GDR, Cuba, MPR, Poland, Romania USSR, CSSR, as well as the SFRY.

The commission considered issues connected with the implementation of tasks set before it, proceeding from decisions of the 42d meeting of the council session and of the session of the CEMA executive Committee. The order and time frame were confirmed for the preparation of program to development and further improve the interconnecting automated complex of communication systems of CEMA member countries for broadcasting all types of information for the period 1990 to 2000 and for longer prospects.

During the commission session a general intergovernmental agreement was signed on all-round cooperation of CEMA member countries in developing communication systems using artificial earth satellites, further improving apparatus of communication satellite systems ground stations, and the setting up of satellite broadcasting systems.

The session took place in a spirit of friendship and complete mutual understanding.

CEMA NUCLEAR FORUM DISCUSSES BUILDING PROGRAM

LD211951 Moscow TASS in English 1712 GMT 21 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 21 TASS -- The CEMA countries have launched a new stage in the development of their power industries: implementation of the programme for building nuclear power stations and nuclear heat-supply stations up to the year 2000. This has been laid down by the 51st meeting of the Standing CMEA Commission on Cooperation in the Use of Atomic Energy for Peaceful Purposes. Plans for building nuclear power plants are especially ambitious for the next five-year period. Whereas by the beginning of 1986 the aggregate capacity of nuclear power plants in the socialist countries amounted to 35,000 megawatts, by 1990 it will grow to 80,000 megawatts. Issues of safety engineering in the nuclear [words indistinct] featured prominently in the deliberations of the standing commission.

Delegate Views Nuclear Session

LD222303 Warsaw PAP in English 1603 GMT 21 Nov 86

[By PAP correspondent Slawomir Popowski]

[Text] Moscow, Nov. 21 -- The CMEA Standing Commission for Cooperation in the Field of Atomic Energy Use for Peaceful Purposes ended its 51st session today with a Polish delegation, headed by President of the National Atomistics Agency Mieczyslaw Sowinski, taking part.

In an interview granted to PAP correspondent the president of the Atomistics Agency said, in part:

"We are, in a way, in a transitional period. On the one hand, we cannot leave the issues of further developing various nuclear energy applications on the sideline because this brings measurable economic results, and even social ones, and on the other hand, we are approaching a period of preparing plans of concrete tasks, agreements, contracts and other modern forms of international cooperation within the frame of the CMEA. The most attention at the commission's session was drawn to a complex programme of scientific-technical progress in which the matter of accelerating the development of nuclear power is treated as one of the five priority topics.

"Much space was devoted in the works of the commission to issues tied with elaborating a new international regime in the field of nuclear power safety. This is not a new subject. It has been tackled for years now, but following the Chernobyl accident its significance has changed qualitatively.

"Today opinions are expressed about nuclear power and the use of atomic energy in general but realistically assessing the situation, in practice there will not be any alternative in the coming decades. One must however do the utmost to provide maximum safety for it.

SHEVARDNADZE SAID TO PROPOSE LINKS WITH EEC

AU211917 Paris AFP in English 1915 GMT 21 Nov 86

[Text] Brussels, Nov 21 (AFP) -- Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze has proposed talks between Soviet and European Economic Community (EEC) experts to develop links, diplomats revealed here Friday.

The proposals were contained in a letter from Mr. Shevardnadze relayed to EEC commissioner Willy de Clerq by Moscow's ambassador to Belgium, Sergey Nikitin, the diplomats said. A Soviet spokesman here said: "We want closer relations between the EEC and the Soviet Union." Experts said contacts begun before Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev came to power in 1985 bore fruit last May when the Kremlin agreed in principle to regular relations with the EEC.

On Monday EEC foreign ministers are to delegate powers to the European Commission to negotiate a trade agreement with Czechoslovakia to relax import controls imposed on some Czech industrial products. The accord will be the second of its type, following an EEC agreement with Rumania.

Experts said the EEC was also exploring possible links with its Eastern Bloc equivalent, the Comecon, although EEC ministers had so far preferred links with individual Eastern Bloc countries, as the Comecon was thought to be dominated by Moscow.

PETROVSKIY PRESS CONFERENCE ON U.S. 'DUPLICITY'

PM221945 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Nov 86 Morning Edition pp 4-5

[TASS report: "The United States: Duplicity in Policy and Half-Truth. Press Conference Given by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V.F. Petrovskiy", in New York on 22 November]

[Text] New York, 22 Nov -- V.F. Petrovskiy has held a press conference at the offices of the Permanent UN Mission to the United Nations during which he touched on problems of international peace and security and certain aspects of the current development of Soviet-American relations.

Dwelling in this connection on President Reagan's recent speech at the Ethics and Public Center and also on recent statements by a number of high-ranking U.S. Administration representatives, he drew attention to the fact that they distort the real situation in the security sphere and events taking place in the world and contain insinuations about the USSR and the Soviet people.

We have to state bluntly that statements of this kind have caused resentment and indignation among the Soviet people and the Soviet Government, he noted. We see them as provocative attempts to wreck the positive process which the entire world is linking with Reykjavik and to rewrite and revise the positions agreed upon there. Here an attempt is being made to use half-truth, direct deception, and slander against the Soviet Union to cover up the duplicity of the U.S. Administration's course in international affairs.

The president's speech at the Ethics and Public Policy Center cannot be categorized as exemplary in either the ethical respect or from the viewpoint of public diplomacy. [paragraph continues]

Regrettably it has to be stated that the virus of disinformation, a repulsive disease, seems to be penetrating increasingly deeply into the top echelons of the American leadership, which is attempting to combine a course aimed at military superiority with deception of the public based on primitive but overtly aggressive and thus particularly dangerous anticommunism.

The President's arguments about communist ideology and communists testify to precisely this.

These same statements unfortunately do not stamp him as a man who understands anything about the in-depth processes of our time. Absolute nonacceptance of the real picture of the modern world with all its complexities and contradictions, but at the same time a world interlinked through the community of destinies, is the only possible explanation for the U.S. leaders' gamble on fueling ideological intolerance and hatred and setting peoples against each other.

It is not just for the sake of it that the President is attempting to awaken a new wave of anti-Sovietism in the country, as usual using the fabricated "Soviet threat" as a cover and resorting to methods of distortion and sometimes even sheer slander not befitting a person of his rank. The grave problems the administration is encountering in its domestic and foreign policy as a result of the scandalous exposure of the duplicity of its approach to a number of important regional problems, the crisis in Central America, the growth of international distrust in the present American leadership's words and deeds, and the defeat in the elections are well known. Instead of honestly and openly admitting shortcomings and mistakes it is attempting to distract the nation's attention, using as a life belt setting people against the Soviet Union and and its policy. To achieve his time-serving objectives the U.S. President even proceeded to insult the Russian, Soviet people's national feelings and dignity.

In urging overt chauvinism and calling for the organization of another "crusade" against socialism the U.S. President has repeated himself: As soon as prospects have emerged for easing tension, halting the arms race, and improving the political atmosphere in the world he takes steps to wreck this positive process and complicate a dialogue that is in any case developing with difficulty.

This is also evidenced in part by his claim that the "position of strength" has provided Washington with something in talks with the USSR. These words are nothing more than a narcotic for propaganda self-gratification, although the president himself cannot fail to know that such a U.S. policy dooms any talks to sterility.

The Soviet-U.S. meeting in Reykjavik, which was the result of common sense, was a kind of touchstone of the two biggest nuclear powers' policy, showing the entire world who is who. The Soviet Union proposed bold and radical plans for a drastic balanced reduction of nuclear potentials and their subsequent complete elimination within a short space of time. By contrast the United States demonstrated itself incapable not only of traveling its half of the road but even of getting moving at all. It was demonstrated quite obviously in Iceland's capital that the United States is obsessed with just one thing -- persisting with the sinister "Star Wars" projects, the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI). In other words, securing the "right" to blackmail both the USSR and the whole of mankind. It is precisely this imperial-militarist approach on the part of the United States that is the main obstacle to ridding mankind of nuclear weapons.

In Reykjavik the President said literally the following: "If we agree on the elimination of all nuclear weapons by the end of the century we can convey this accord to our delegations in Geneva so that they can prepare a treaty you could sign during your visit to the United States." You only have to compare this statement with his subsequent statements to clearly see where the U.S. Administration's duplicity primarily lies.

First the administration began to deny that the accord related to all nuclear arms. Then it stated that only ballistic missiles were meant, excluding those parts of strategic forces in which the United States has traditionally had advantages. It is impossible to disregard the content of a Chicago University speech by Secretary of State G. Shultz in which he attempted to insist whith astounding stubbornness on a distorted version of what happened in Reykjavik and also of the reasons for growing strategic instability. He even started talking about retaining a proportion of ballistic missiles. Such are the stages in the U.S. retreat from the positions reached in Reykjavik.

The President's claims that the United States has submitted at the talks proposals taking Reykjavik into account are designed for the uninformed, to put it mildly. What The United States is currently offering is a revision of Reykjavik, a retreat back to the mothballed old American position.

Nor is there a grain of truth in the claims that the USSR has only now produced proposals for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Starting back in 1946, it is impossible to find a single page in history, a single year when specific actions by the USSR in favor of eliminating the nuclear danger have not been recorded.

On 15 January this year USSR advanced a program of unprecedented specificity and realism for gradually freeing the world of nuclear weapons by the end of the century. It was this program that formed the driving force for the positive things it proved possible to achieve in Reykjavik.

The truth is that concrete proposals from the Soviet side designed to secure the speediest movement forward from the positions reached in Reykjavik are now lying on the table at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms.

The sides' proposals since Reykjavik are clearly targeted in opposite directions -- the Soviet proposals toward disarmament, and the American proposals toward military superiority.

The U.S. Administration claims that SDI is an insurance policy in the nuclear and space age. If there can be such a thing as an insurance policy in politics it should consist of honesty in conducting affairs and elementary respect for your own word.

How U.S. policy fits in with the interests of the world community is convincingly evidenced by the results of the 41st UN General Assembly's examination of disarmament questions. Voting in the First Committee on draft resolutions relating to disarmament has just ended. The United States did not support more than half the decisions adopted, and on 15 occasions it voted against either completely on its own or in the company of one of two countries. Yet these decisions concern the elimination of the nuclear threat, the prevention of an arms race in space, the ending of nuclear tests, and other most important questions of war and peace.

The duplicity of American policy can also be seen in its approach to regional conflicts. For Grenada, as for Libya and Lebanon, Nicaragua and Afghanistan, the American dream as seen by the President has turned into a nightmare of violence and state terrorism. The messianic ambitions permeating the President's speeches boil down in practice to a policy of neoglobalism that guides the United States in its aspiration to transform the world into its domain, impose "the law of the jungle" on interstate relations, and suppress by force the people's desire for freedom and national independence.

We are realists, V.F. Petrovskiy stated in conclusion, and realize that sharp ideological polemics and rivalry between ideas about mankind's past, present, and future are also part of the modern world. But the USSR advocates that the ideological struggle does not turn into ideological warfare, does not serve as an obstacle to the development of relations between countries with different social systems, but constitutes a constructive element in an honest competition between spiritual values for the sake of establishing good-neighborliness and cooperation in a diverse but so closely interconnected world.

'Virus' of Misinformation

LD211743 Moscow TASS in English 1116 GMT 21 Nov 86

[Excerpts] New York November 21 TASS -- Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy gave a news conference here Thursday to discuss international peace and security and some aspects of Soviet-U.S. relations.

Speaking of President Reagan's speech at the Ethics and Public Policy Center and latest remarks by senior U.S. Administration officials, he said they had misrepresented the true state of affairs in the field of security, distorted the substance of international developments and floated insinuations against the USSR and the Soviet people.

"We should say bluntly that such statements have caused resentment and indignation among the Soviet people and in the Soviet Government," he said.

"We see them as provocative attempts to scuttle the positive process which is associated throughout the world with Reykjavik, and rewrite and revise the positions agreed upon there," Petrovskiy added.

"They are attempting to cover up the U.S. Administration's duplicity in international affairs with half-truth, outright deception and slander against the Soviet Union," he said.

Deplorably, one has to state that the virus of misinformation, a disgusting disease, seems to be penetrating deeper and deeper into the highest echelons of the U.S. leadership which attempts to couple the course of military supremacy and scaling up tension with the deception of the public built on primitive, openly aggressive and hence exceptionally dangerous anti-communism, Vladimir Petrovskiy said furthermore. The U.S. President's reasoning about the communist ideology and communists show precisely this.

Alas, these pronouncements do not characterize him as a man who perceives anything in the in-depth processes of our time. The U.S. leaders' stake on fanning up ideological intolerance and hatred, on putting peoples against each other can be explained only by absolute non-admission of the real picture of the modern world with all of its difficulties and contradictions, but which is at the same time interrelated by the community of destinies.

It is not a good life that forces the President to spark off a new tide of anti-Sovietism, using as usual the imaginary "Soviet threat" as a cover-up, and resorting to methods of distortions and sometimes sheer slander which does not befit a person of his rank. The grave problems encountered by the current administration in its domestic and foreign policies as a result of the scandalous revelation of the duplicity of its approach to a number of important regional problems, the crisis in Central America, the growth of mistrust in the world in words and deeds of the current U.S. leadership, the defeats at the elections are well known.

Instead of an honest and open admission of the shortcomings and mistakes, it tries to divert the attention of the nation, using the setting of people against the Soviet Union, its policy as a life-buoy. To attain these time-serving objectives of his the U.S. President went even to insulting the national feelings and dignity of the Russian, Soviet people.

In calling for open chauvinism, for staging a new crusade against socialism, the President has repeated himself: As soon as the prospect was opened up for relaxing tension, stopping the arms race and ameliorating the political atmosphere in the world, he undertakes steps to stymie this positive process, to complicate the dialogue developing uneasily as it is.

This is also evidenced in part by his allegation that the position from strength gave something to Washington at the talks with the USSR. It seems that the statements of this kind, by whoever they are made, have long since ceased to be received in earnest. [passage omitted]

"Substituting ideological sabotage and 'crusades' for ideological struggle is fraught in the nuclear and space age with a grave threat to the fate of peace. This is being done by those attempting to 'stop' communism by means of low-grade lies about socialist countries," he said.

"This is the meaning of the hysterical campaigns under the slogan of protecting freedoms and human rights, that is 'protecting' them in the Soviet Union and other countries, not at the crusaders' own home where they really need to be protected," the Soviet deputy foreign minister said.

"The President announced intent to keep a scrap of paper, allegedly received from a labor camp in the USSR, for all his life. By contrast, the international bill of rights, which ought to be hung somewhere prominently in the White House, has not even been remembered by the United States. This is not surprising, as it has neither ratified this bill or put it in effect," Petrovskiy said.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD240156 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 23 Nov 86

["International Observers Roundtable" program chaired by Igor Pavlovich Charikov, All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator; with Aleksandr Nikolayevich Antsiferov, international affairs journalist; and Viktor Aleksandrovich Tsoppi, member of the editorial board of NOVOYE VREMYA]

[Text] [Charikov] Hello, esteemed comrades! One of the most important events of the coming week may certainly be considered to be the upcoming visit by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the Republic of India.

At the present time the Indian press is carrying a great deal of material appraising the state of Soviet-Indian relations in diverse fields, including the economic, scientific and technological, and cultural fields. Reference is also being made to the Soviet-Indian treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation, which was signed back in 1971. That document did indeed lay the foundation for the good-neighborliness and cooperation between our two great countries. I recall in this connection the visit by Rajiv Gandhi, India's prime minister, to the Soviet Union in May of last year. Incidentally, it was his first visit abroad, and it was to our country. This is how Rajiv Gandhi appraised the state of Soviet-Indian relations. He said this: Friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union is an inseparable part of India's foreign policy, and the Indian people regard the Soviet people as their friend, a friend who has always stood beside India in times of difficulty. I think it would be virtually impossible to select better words to characterize relations between our two countries.

I would like to enumerate all the figures that have been given of late in newspaper commentaries characterizing the developmeng of our relations in the sphere of the economy, scientific and technological links, and so on, but I am only able to say that our relations are developing successfully, and what is most important, for the good of both countries.

In the political sphere, the standpoints of our countries either coincide or else are very close. Rajeshwar Rao, general secretary of the National Council of the Indian Communist Party, published an article in the NEW AGE magazine that says the following: Of great significance is the broad program for ensuring international security and cooperation in the Asian-Pacific area, which was formulated in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech in Vladivostok. Cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and with all peace-loving Asian states in the name of ensuring peace and cooperation in Asia and Oceania accords with the national interests of our country.

[Antsiferov] Here too I think that one should not fail to mention the fact that Delhi, the Indian capital, has given its name to an entire political concept, which is highly popular at the present time. I have in mind the Delhi Six. The Delhi Six and its political activities have brought together the long-term political interests of a whole group of countries -- a very large number of countries -- well-known in political terminology as the nonaligned states and as the Nonaligned Movement. If we look at the motives and the demands of the situation that existed in the world, say, 20 years ago -- that is, if we closely view the origins of the Nonaligned Movement -- we shall see that aspirations for peace and support for the ideas of disarmament, peaceful coexistence and good-neighborliness were characteristic of the movement right from the start. But whereas at the beginning of their existence, say, 20 to 25 years ago, the nonaligned countries laid particular emphasis on issues connected with decolonization and development of national economies, national infrastructures, national cultures, and so on and so forth, there is now the totally clear-cut and unambiguous formulation of the political demands, without whose fulfillment it has proved, and they understand this -- it has proved impossible to fulfill the demands of an economic nature or demands, say, affecting the national and regional interests of countries. The Delhi Six, as a paramount demand -- or rather not as a demand but as one of the most important conditions for giving the fullest effect to, and defending the interests of the nonaligned countries -- has been putting forward the issue of disarmament, above all nuclear disarmament.

It is not by chance that the leaders of the Delhi Six in their appeal to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev approve of and support the Soviet Union's initiative in proclaiming a unilateral moratorium on the testing of nuclear weapons; it is not by chance that they have addressed the same appeal to U.S. President Reagan to join in the Soviet moratorium; it is not by chance that the Delhi Six has been advocating the implementation of the idea of universal and total disarmament, above all nuclear disarmament.

[Tsoppi] I think that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to India will certainly encompass all those problems that not only have to do with our bilateral relations but are also of global significance. This is shown by the expectancy and the frame of mind with which the Soviet leader's visit to India is at present awaited. The HINDUSTAN TIMES, which is one of India's largest newspapers, has been saying that the Soviet leader's visit will have political, economic, and strategic -- note the word strategic -- consequences, which go far beyond the framework of bilateral relations. The Third World, which for brevity's sake is the name not very accurately given to the developing countries, is now proving more and more convincingly that it by no means wishes to reconcile itself to the role of an unnecessary third party. Great India, about which we have just been speaking, is an example of this, but it is not the only example. In short, I want to say that all peoples, wherever they might live, and all states have at the present time a host of reasons to actively struggle against the extremely big military danger that stems from the United States.

Perhaps as never before this danger became obvious to everyone during the past week. President Reagan made a speech at the ethics and public policy research center. The ethical value of this grandiose self-exposure surely lay in the fact that it provided splendid proof that Reagan and ethics are not related, or even acquainted, and that the policy of the present U.S. Administration is not burdened with any ethical views. There has never before been such malicious threats to deal with mankind as oneself saw fit -- and at any cost in blood. To all intents and purposes, Reagan has given up the very idea, let alone the practice, of peaceful coexistence, and has been announcing this in very coarse terms.

[Antisifervo] But perhaps this is just rhetoric.

[Tsoppi] No, this is a matter of deed, and the symptoms that we are detecting at the present time are, to speak bluntly, sinister. Well, take Reykjavik, for instance. Reykjavik -- what is that? Is roughly, I rather think, how the U.S. position looks at present. Were accords reached there with the Soviet Union? That didn't take place! There was nothing! Today Washington is arguing in roughly the same way that Naska shouted in Gorkiy's play, "The Lower Depths." No, there was nothing. There was nothing because as it has become clear the United States doesn't need this today.

[Charikov] But of course, not all of the United States.

[Tsoppi] Not all of the United States. I'm thinking of course of the administration. This is harmful both to the President and to his associates. Nothing of this is necessary because it could lead to nuclear disarmament, to a peaceful world and to normal international relations! You see what a nightmare could take place! In a word, one must forget, sooner forget, about Reykjavik, and make the whole world forget about it. It's true that there are more than enough other causes for hysteria in Washington. For example: To justify armed aggression against Libya, the clever ideologists who work for the administration conducted a wide-scale campaign of disinformation about Libya. It ended with a shocking scandal.

The evidence concerning CIA agent Hasenfus, in Nicaragua, was an equally damaging exposure. And in the days immediately preceding Reagan's speech, which I was talking about, the story over Iran grew to the scale of a catastrophe. As you remember, comrades, it became clear that the U.S. President had somehow twisted himself around his own little finger. In violation of the law he himself had signed, he delivered weapons to Iran, numbered, again by himself, in the list of terrorist states. They didn't succeed in stopping the cat from getting out of the bag. The whole world took in this latest scandal with disdain, and I would even put it stronger than that: Loyal allies of the United States were horrified. As it emerged, the overwhelming majority of American people no longer believe their beloved President.

[Charikov] Incidentally, there are statistical data. The LOS ANGELES TIMES newspaper recently conducted a public opinion poll in connection with this scandal: the secret delivery of weapons to Iran. Only 14 percent of Americans polled believe the President, that these deliveries were not carried out within the framework of a deal to free hostages. Only 14 -- imagine it -- only 14 percent of the American people believe him. public opinion polls in the United States -- take my word for it -- are taken on a scientific basis, and therefore they are a very clear reflection of the frame of mind of the American people. Only 14 percent! What a drop in trust in the President, and we have seen it in literally a few months!

[Tsoppi] And in the last few days, especially.

[Charikov] And people were perfectly right when they said that as a whole the start of President Reagan's fall in prestige began after Reykjavik, when in essence they lied to the United States; when a people who very much placed grandiose hopes on this meeting were given a completely wrong account, with black being said to be white, and with everything being turned upside down. In essence, they deceived the people.

You know, recently, about 1 or 2 weeks ago, we broadcast a radio hookup between Vilnius and Milwaukee. I was a presenter at that time and you know, from the nature of the question the Americans asked, you could judge that generally they don't know anything about this. One participant -- unfortunately I don't remember the surname -- told us the following story, that some kind of scientist was supposed to visit him in the town of Milwaukee, which is a town in the State of Wisconsin, a scientist who worked as a contract employee for the U.S. Air Force for several years. He worked on some kind of new type of weaponry, and he was supposed to travel to Milwaukee in order to take about how pernicious the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative is not only for the United States but also for the whole world. Incidentally, I've heard that they've now rephrased it to the strategic burial initiative. So this scientisit was supposed to hold a press conference in Milwaukee, where he was getting ready to talk about the grandiose danger inherent in this venture. And what do you think? The mass news media, in this case the ones in Milwaukee -- I don't know, it's as though it was at somebody's prompting, at somebody's command -- they instantly turned their backs on this person.

[Tsoppi] As though they had been gagged.

[Charikov] And all three major television networks -- ABC, NBC and CBS -- recalled their film crews, and this press conference was not shown. And this American, a participant in the radiobridge, a participant in the discussion, says: And we never did get to know what the Strategic Defense Initiative represents.

[Antsiferov] Yes. You know, I'd also like to add that the opportunities for manipulating public opinion in the United states are very great, but obviously they're not infinite, especially when the administration begins to directly contradict itself in its policy and in essence turns into -- well, to try and find some kind of image, in this case, a dog trying to catch its own tail. Let's say if we recall, in connection with Iran, the U.S. position on Camp David and the striving for peace in the Near East, and so on and so forth, which is proclaimed in this connection, and all the mass of rhetoric used to demonstrate this, and if we consider within this context the delivery of weapons to Iran, then we'll see the aims of the United States in that region. It's not by chance that President Reagan, coming before journalists in the White House, said -- I'll allow myself to quote: our political aims have never caused any kind of objections. Naturally, that means in circles close to the administration. Only means and ways to achieve them have caused disagreements. That is, the political aims, it's perfectly obvious in connection with the delivery of weapons to Iran, perfectly obvious. And here one can only vary the means: it's either the concluding of a separate deal of the Camp David type, or it's the kindling...

[Tsoppi, interrupting] Attempts to change a regime in one's favor.

[Antsiferov] Absolutely right, or it's the kindling of interstate dissension interstate hostility, and in essence the continuation of the fratricidal and senseless war between Iran and Iraq.

[Charikov] In a regular news review, a U.S. television journalist called things by their true names. This is how he explained the purposes of trying somehow to get into Iran through the back door: He named two aims, oil and proximity to the borders of the Soviet Union. I think this is a very accurate definition of the aims.

[Tsoppi] Yes, of course. And when we speak of aims and means it seems to me that we ought to sum all this up with an old and simple truth: A criminal design will be used to justify criminal methods. You were talking of the 14 percent of Americans, Igor Pavolovich, who are still entertaining illusions, who have not yet understood the essence of what their government, their administration is doing today. This 14 percent has not yet got used to the idea, as David Broder writes, for instance, in THE WASHINGTON POST, that this is all the result of a fatal mixture of ignorance, conceit, and uncontrolled actions in an atmosphere of carefully arranged but inevitably short-lived secrecy. There, are, of course, still people in the United States who have not realized, as the same journalist states, that the present administration has slid a long way down the slippery slope that led to the collapse of the Johnson and Nixon presidencies. It seems to me to be true that the collapse that has now emerged risks turning out even more ignominiously. It would be better, of course, if the President based his actions on common sense, let alone peaceableness. but that is not the case. Let us be realists. Changes in the United States do not depend on us, they depend first and foremost on the Americans themselves. As the wise saying goes, it is better to have bad weather than no weather at all. No, we are not capitulating in this battle for peace that has now become even more difficult, for peace for all people, including the American people, and we do not propose to start thinking in the old way. If anyone is counting on us doing so, these are vain calculations.

But let us return to Reykjavik. The Reykjavik meeting resulted in the U.S. allies in Europe also being forced to adopt a stance.

[Antsiferov] Altogether, the Reykjavik effect is, of course, a broad concept, if I may say so. And there are both the official allies, and then there are the populations of the states that belong to NATO. As far as the populations of the NATO states are concerned, an interesting tendency is discernible here. According to a recent public opinion poll carried out by the Emnid Institute in Bielefeld, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is currently more popular in the FRG than President Reagan.

[Charikov] It is not, of course, a question of the personal popularity of either one or the other, but it is clearly a question of...

[Tsoppi, interrupting] It is an assessment of their policies.

[Charikov] Yes, an assessment of their policies, their contribution to the tackling of the world's complicated political tasks mankind faces today. And tha. are faced by the American people and the peoples of Western Europe.

[Tsoppi] The whole point is that our policies, our diplomacy and our peaceful offensive are personified in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, who heads the...

[Antsiferov, interrupting] That is precisely the point. DER SPIEGEL says on the subject of the results of this opinion poll that they are sensational, and that the popularity of the U.S. President depends to a great extent on the U.S. policies directed toward a further increase in the arms race. The same polling institute established after Reykjavik that FRG citizens, when asked which country -- the USSR or United States -- demonstrates greater commitment to concluding disarmament agreements, voiced a perfectly clear and unambiguous preference for the Soviet Union. You can judge the degree to which this is unprecedented for the FRG if only by the fact that all these polls are conducted in a context of the most severe ideological pressure, in the context of the anti-Sovietism the bourgeois press disseminates in the FRG.

[Cherikov] Not without assistance from across the Atlantic, of course

[Antsiferov] Not without accompaniment, and at any rate...

[Tsoppi, interrupting] Not without the involvement of major statesmen in the FRG.

[Antsiferov] Quite right. But it seems to me that here, on this question, a major role has been played by the West German peace supporters' campaign. The country is just at the moment marking the anniversary -- the word jubilee is not one I could bring myself to utter -- the third anniversary of the adoption by the West German Bundestag of the decision to site U.S. Pershings and cruise missiles on the territory of West Germany. The West German public is marking this sombre and, I would add, ignominious anniversary with demonstrations, meetings and participation in symbolic blockades. The pitch of the protests remains as high as three years ago.

[Tsoppi] Aleksandr Nikolayevich, I remember that we were both working in Bonn at the time.

[Antsiferov] Quite right, and these events were unfolding before my very eyes. Now, as then, the pitch of the antiwar protests of the West German public is not abating.

If we call these blockades symbolic, or rather the demonstrators themselves call their actions, their blockades, symbolic, they are symbolic only in the sense that as a rule these are unarmed, peaceful participants in antiwar protests confronting the army and police, who are armed to the teeth, soldiers of the U.S. Army and a whole gang of plainclothes agents working for various intelligence agencies from both sides of the Atlantic.

[Tsoppi] I would like to add that members of the antiwar movements have become almost the main object of persecution by the authorities. This is because the authorities both in the United States, and, in this case, the FRG, see the antiwar movement as the main obstacle on the path to the attainment of their goals. Literally a few days ago a mass protest demonstration was held in the United States outside the offices of the Department of Energy, which controls, or rather carries out the program of nuclear blasts in Nevada. Around 200 participants in the demonstration were arrested just because they ventured to go out into the streets to demand that the government should halt nuclear tests and join the Soviet moratorium. Some of them held up the following slogan: We are ashamed to be American. Around 200 people were arrested because they were exercising a right enshrined in the Constitution. And literally at the same time a demonstration was under way near the nuclear test range in Nevada. And the participants of this demonstration were arrested in the same manner.

[Antsiferov] Generally speaking, repressions, as has been rightfully noted, are a typical reaction of those who hold power against the participants of the antiwar movement. Precisely for this reason I would like to stress that for participants in the antiwar movement these actions are not in any way symbolic.

[Tsoppi] These are active steps, of course.

[Antsiferov] Naturally, the blows they receive are not symbolic, their arrests are not symbolic at all either, nor are their prosecutions symbolic; and you cannot at all call symbolic those fines that they are forced to pay or else they will just be simply taken to the prison.

[Tsoppi] And this is because they are fighting against the decisions of their governments that are not at all symbolic but against decisions that are very dangerous.

[Antisiferov] Right. And against missiles which are not symbolic.

[Tsoppi] Yes, against missiles that are not symbolic, but quite concrete, real ones, loaded with nuclear devices.

[Antsiferov] Yes. But it is also necessary here, it seems to me, to take into consideration one very essential nuance. The actions of peace followers sometimes have, as it were, a mediating character in the development of the real political situation in their country. They have a mediating effect on the political situation. If, say, we observe the development of the political situation in the FRG, which I came to know while I was working in that country, I must note that the political face of the country has changed in many areas over the past years precisely thanks to the antiwar movement. And what has come of it? The antiwar movement itself, the demands for disarmament, and the demands to barring U.S. first strike nuclear arms from the territory of the country, turned out to be that very common denominator from which a whole political party arose. I mean the Greens...

[Charikov interrupts] Which is acquiring an increasingly large number of followers. Not only in the FRG.

[Antsiferov] Yes. If, say 7 or 8 years ago the Greens movement comprised large groups of the population but they were dispersed around various parts of the FRG and used to voice demands that were local in nature, like say, for environmental protection...

[Tsoppi]... Sometimes made by naive pacifists...

[Antisiferov] This is now a movement aware of its role, which is a political party. The main demand of this party in the area of politics and foreign policy in particular is precisely the demand for the rejection of the siting, and for the withdrawal, of all U.S. nuclear missiles from FRG territory.

And look what changes have taken place over the past few years within the Social Democratic Party, whose leadership in the past, so to speak, were the ringleaders of the U.S. plan for siting missiles in Europe. At present, however, they are opposing the FRG Government on this matter and advocating the withdrawal of the missiles from the territory of the country.

[Tsoppi] I would still like to get back for a minute to our dear Europe, since what is happening in the United States, what is happening in Soviet-U.S. relations, and what is happening in the worldwide debate on the subject of whether the planet and all the living world on the planet should or should not exist -- all this is bound up with the fate of Europe. All this depends on how not only sensible people, world public opinion, public opinion of those countries that are the subject of our conversation here, and the public opinion of the FRG in particular, perceive all that is happening, but it also depends on the governments of these countries, unfortunately. It depends on them, but why unfortunately? Because if we observe now what sort of position the governments of the FRG, France, and Britain, all these countries have taken since Reykjavik, this position may seem very strange, illogical and inconsistent --although it has a logic of its own, of course.

Let us recall that when Reagan, in conditions quite different from the present ones, put forward his zero option, NATO's West European members applauded it tumultuously. But now, when an accord on scrapping both Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe has been reached in principle in Reykjavik, these same people, these same statesmen are loudly indignant and, I would say, are even lamenting from fear. British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher went to Washington a few days ago to persuade Reagan to renounce everything that Reykjavik has led to, and judging by everything, she succeeded.

[Antsiferov] What I don't know is who was trying to persuade whom.

[Tsoppi] Yes. And in Washington the following connection can be traced: In Washington, as they heed these revelations, they justify their own rejection of the Reykjavik accords, they justify it by the fact that, as noble people, they can't ignore the interests of their allies. That's how imperialist solidarity, or, if you like, mutual assistance operates.

[Charikov] I would now like to summarize the outcome of our discussion. The situation in the world is strained, and all the same we are not going to plunge into despondency. We look to the future with optimism, and we merely believe that politics -- in the sense in which we have the word in mind -- is a sequence of efforts aimed at achieving our main goal, which was formulated in the CPSU program, in the materials of the recent CPSU congress, and in speeches by our leaders. On this, comrades, we end our program.

COMMENTARIES CONDEMN U.S. REYKJAVIK STANCE

Reagan 'Distorted' Discussions

LD211748 Moscow TASS in English 1641 GMT 21 Nov 86

[Isn't There Too Much Confusion and Distortion?" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow November 21 TASS -- Follows commentary by Vladimir Bogachev, TASS military news analyst:

In the course of his latest news conference, U.S. President Ronald Reagan touched upon the results of the Soviet-American summit meeting and said, in particular, that "for the first time, there was an agreement reached on the desirability of eliminating all strategic nuclear missiles in a five-year period and then dealing with the intermediate-range missiles in Germany."

The President has for the umpteenth time been "inaccurate" on some points, which was immediately taken note of by hair-splitting newsmen. At the subsequent briefing, Larry Speakes, a White House spokesman, admitted that Reagan had made only one mistake and claimed that it was simply a slip of the tongue when the President mentioned a five-year period for the elimination of weapons intead of a ten-year period. This wouldn't be worth mentioning were it the President's sole mistake.

Unfortunately, the President has, apparently, that time not as a result of being absent-minded, distorted also the essence of the questions discussed at Reykjavik. As follows from the records of the conversations between the Soviet and the American leaders, in real fact, President Reagan expressed at Reykjavik preparedness to elimnate over a period of ten years not only strategic nuclear missiles, but also all nuclear systems, including bombs, battlefield weapons, cruise missiles, weapons of submarines, medium-range weapons, etc.

The chief executive of the United States agreed to prepare for signing the text of an appropriate agreement.

The White House spokesman clearly did not wish to correct the distortion by the President of the real course of the talks in Iceland. Moreover, reports appeared in the U.S. press claiming that also the Soviet officials declared that the point at issue at Reykjavik was a reduction over the first five years and elimination by the year of 1996 not of all nuclear systems, bu only of ballistic missiles. This is no slip of the tongue, but a deliberate lie.

In its unbridled propaganda campaign aimed at presenting the course of the talks in Iceland in a distorted light, at revising the agreements reached there, Washington is having recourse to ever new, increasingly unscrupulous methods and manipulations.

It must be noted, for that matter, that at his news conference President Reagan cliamed for an unknown reason that the point of discussion at Reykjavik was that of "intermediate-range missiles in Germany." Meanwhile, American intermediate-range missiles are deployed not only in the FRG, but also in other European countries -- in Britain, Italy, Belgium and the Netherlands. On the other hand, there are no medium-range missiles either in the German Democratic Republic, or in other East European Warsaw Treaty member countries. All the Soviet medium-range missiles are based on the USSR's territory.

The latter "inaccuracy" can hardly be described as a slip of the tongue or a deliberate distortion of reality. Apparently, in this case it is an insufficiently profound knowledge of the essence of the matter, which does no credit to the President.

The news conference given by President Reagan, as is also pointed out in the American newspapers, again raises the question whether he exceeds in his public statements the limit of contradictoriness and confusion admissible for the head of a great power?

The Western observers point out that the U.S. President's latest statements in public create the impression of a dilettante approach by the current U.S. Administration to the problem of war and peace, call in question the very possibility to trust U.S. actions in the international arena.

Tolkunov Hits Shultz 'Revision'

PM231915 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Nov 86 First Edition p 5

[A. Tolkunov "Rejoinder": "Reversing"]

[Text] Everything is in a real muddle in the White House and the presidential political court following Reykjavik. Everybody, including the President himself, is trying in his own way to strike out the accords reached there, which it proved impossible to implement solely because of the American side's unwillingness to abandon the "Star Wars" program.

Yet another example of this political disarray is provided by the lengthy speech delivered by U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz at Chicago University. We will leave to the secretary of state's conscience his arguments about the Soviet military threat and outright falsification of historical facts. All that is an old refrain.

What is new is that the secretary of state is no longer talking about the elimination of "all ballistic missiles," although, as is known, the destruction of all offensive strategic weapons, not just ballistic missiles, was discussed in Reykjavik. He made a further revision of the results of Reykjavik and even proceeded to renounce his words. He is now proposing "the retention of a small arsenal of nuclear ballistic missiles." And that is not all. "A large fleet of aircraft and cruise missiles would enable the United States and NATO to retain a powerful nuclear potential" -- this is what Mr Shultz is counting on.

But it was none other than Shultz himself who stated for all to hear, an hour after the summit meeting ended 12 October, that "all offensive strategic arms would be essentially eliminated in this 10-year period." Where is this promise just over a month later?

It has remained mere words. In practice, however, Washington is putting a match to something which other people built with such difficulty -- The SALT II and ABM treaties.

Where the priest leads, the congregation follows. The order for sabotage was given to the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks, where the latest round ended recently. While the Soviet proposals submitted there fully correspond to the results reached at Hofdi House, the other side's proposals constitute a departure from Reykjavik and an attempt to distort its content. [paragraph continues]

The U.S. representatives are categorically opposed to sealing off channels for putting weapons into space and are erecting barriers to the elimination of offensive arms.

So G. Shultz' speech is extremely symptomatic. All the indications are that official Washington is not ready, not able, or rather simply not willing to think in a new way in our alarming nuclear age. Having taken a single timid step forward in Reykjavik, there has since been a sharp backward step to the accompaniment of squawks from militarist circles. But can reversing get you very far?

SHISHLIN CONDEMNS REAGAN-THATCHER SDI ALLIANCE

LD232357 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 23 Nov 86

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Nikolay Shishlin]

[Text] There is no doubt that it was precisely Reykjavik and its results which were the pivot of the talks held by British Prime Minister Thatcher with U.S. President Reagan. After these talks the British press wrote that Thatcher is now becoming Reagan's understudy and she will be taking the determining initiatives in the development of East-West dialogue on arms problems. However, Margaret Thatcher did formulate what might perhaps be called a British minimum program. (?This looks) approximately as follows: The first thing, she believes, is the need to solve the problem of intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Europe. Then, to come to agreement on a 50-percent reduction in Soviet and U.S. strategic offensive weapons. Then she believes it is necessary to ban chemical weapons; all this of course will be subject to international monitoring. In this minimum program there is this important statement: We -- the pronoun is used meaning Reagan and Thatcher -- well, we have also reached a joint opinion on the need to continue the SDI research program, which is permitted by the ABM Treaty. However, in the reasoning of the British prime minister, there is also the theory that a permanently stable, general equilibrium is needed. This, of course, all sounds very nice, but only for inexperienced ears.

Look at what is missing fom the British package, relatively speaking. Well, first let's start with the fact that there isn't a package. The package on the whole is in pieces. Then, while talking of reductions in strategic offensive weapons, Thatcher leaves out the idea of eliminating all strategic weapons which, incidentally, was the issue in Reykjavik. I'm not looking now at the fact that commitment is being declared time and again to SDI, that is, to the Star Wars program, not a word is being said about stopping nuclear testing and not a word is being said about Britain's own position on Britain's own measures aimed at increasing arms, including nuclear arms, production. In this connection, I should like to say yes, they're not forgetting Reykjavik in West Europe, but the activity of West Europeans, at least of a sector of West Europeans, is heading in a strange direction. Fears are being increasingly whipped up, and legends of all kinds are being artificially exaggerated to the effect that, they say, freeing Europe from nuclear arms will lead to the security of Europe being shaken, if it doesn't actually collapse. Thoughts involuntarily creep in that this is being done consciously. Someone, in Europe it seems, has an interest in the United States being deeply drawn into confrontations with the Soviet Union.

Inasmuch as this confrontation itself, you know, places a certain burden on the U.S. economy, and given the complex interrelationships of West European capital with the pushing transnational corporations, then this utter involvement confrontation apparently suits certain sectors of West European political and so called business circles. This, of course, is serious. Therefore, it seems the demand, the need for reaching the new political thinking, should not just be addressed at West Europeans, but at their relations with the United States, so that West Europeans too can fully realize the responsibility which today lies with each country for the future of Europe and of the whole world.

This new political thinking however is unfortunately still being established in the minds of West European politicians with some difficulty. I'm not talking now of those political forces in West Europe which represent, not yesterday, but the day before that. That day before yesterday though is present on the European political scene, particularly on the West German one.

CONTINUING REPORTAGE OF IRAN ARMS CONTROVERSY

Criticism Intensifies

LD221716 Moscow TASS in English 1701 GMT 22 Nov 86

[Text] Washington November 22 TASS -- THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper reports today that closed-door hearings have been held at the Select Committees on Intelligence of both houses of U.S. Congress in connection with the scandalous exposure of U.S. arms shipments to Tehran.

'Explanations' to the lawmakers were given by John Poindexter, assistant to the President for national security affairs, and William Casey, director of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA).

At the close of the hearings, many members of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Senate intensified their criticism of the White House-directed operation to ship arms to Iran.

The failure of the venture gave rise to fierce discord within the administration. According to the ABC TV network, executives who were involved in preparing the operation and carrying it out are now trying to shift the blame for it on one another.

THE LOS ANGELES TIMES newspaper reports in this connection that U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz advised Reagan to dismiss John Poindexter. A strong blow on Shultz himself was dealt by Robert McFarlane, former assistant to the President for national security affairs, who had made a trip to Tehran at the head of a secret U.S. mission.

He stated that he personally had repeatedly briefed the U.S. secretary of state on all details of the operation.

Shultz, who had previously maintained that he had not known anything about the operation, gave no reply to the accusation.

Meanwhile Donald Regan, chief of the White House staff, has recalled that although McFarland now describes the operaton to ship arms to Iran as error, the idea to carry out such an operation belonged precisely to him.

Following the hearings in Congress, James C. Wright Jr. leader of the Democratic majority in the U.S. house of Representatives, has accused President Reagan of breaking the law by ordering CIA Director William Casey not to tell Congress about the secret Iran operation.

At a meeting with journalists Wright likewise disproved the White House assertions that arms shipments to Iran were ostensibly purely symbolical.

He said, in particular, that the CIA received from the Pentagon and shipped to Iran through Israel 2,008 tow anti-tank weapons and at least 235 components for Hawk anti-aircraft missile systems.

In payment for the weapons Tehran has remitted more than 12 million dollars to one of Swiss banks.

Casey Briefing Viewed

LD221000 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 22 Nov 86

[Text] Silence seems to have become the most widespread method of U.S. diplomacy. This is shown by the scandal of the supply of U.S. weapons to Iran. REUTER reports that in Washington, CIA Director Casey has for the first time held a briefing in Congress about the supplies. The briefing took place behind closed doors. One can imagine how the CIA head belatedly revealed his secrets to the legislators. Suffice it to cite the utterances of a Democratic senator and member of the Senate committee which listened to Casey. We now have more unanswered questions than before, the senator said after the briefing. It has become known that weapons worth $12 million were supplies to Iran. At least, that is the figure cited by the agency.

King Husayn of Jordan has stated that the deliveries of weapons to Iran outraged all Arabs and could not in any way promote the ending of the Iran-Iraq conflict.

Sales Show U.S. 'Hegemony'

LD221449 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 22 Nov 86

[Text] In the United States the scandal surrounding the secret deliveries of weapons to Iran is gathering strength. Over to Aleksandr Korshunov, who is presenting the Saturday radio panorama program:

Yes, indeed; despite efforts by senior representatives of the administration to distance themselves from this affair, or, at least, to damp it down, more and more new facts are emerging. For example, the war department was involved in this secret deal from the very start. NBC-TV has reported that, following the decision on military contacts with Iran, the White House ordered the Pentagon to select the types of weapon Iran required, including TOW guided antitank rockets and spares for Hawk anti-aircraft batteries.

In the United States much is being said about the moral aspect of this case. Attempts are being made to explain the responsibility for misleading Congress and the public by subjective factors such as, incorrect behavior by political figures. But it seems to me that the nub of the matter resides not only here -- not to a great extent -- since, against the background of the scandal, the attempts by U.S. imperialism, embodied in the doctrine of neoglobalism, to interfere by any possible means in the internal affairs of other peoples have become particularly apparent.

Within the framework of this concept, while purporting to wish an end to the Iran-Iraq conflict, the United States tries to extinguish it in the U.S. styles, by adding fuel to the flames.

It is appropriate to recall a statement made a few months ago by Secretary of State Shultz concerning, I quote: the way secret operations to deliver arms -- and there have been some -- give Washington an opportunity to exert influence without direct confrontation.

A broad appraisal of neoglobalism was given by Lewis, a well-known U.S. observer. This concept, he wrote, means that the United States must intervene in wars being waged in third-world countries.

However, for the sake of justice, I will point out that the strategy of neoglobalism itself cannot be called a new one. As far back as the beginning of this century, Mark Twain wrote about a general who said: We are Anglo-Saxons, and when an Anglo-Saxon needs something, he goes and takes it, as a symbol of U.S. ambitions and claims to hegemony.

Now U.S. imperialism is resorting to a vast array of methods, from direct armed intervention, to subversive and secret operations, in its drive to establish hegemony over almost the whole planet. As for the administration, now so plainly exposed in its wrongdoing, it is not in the least discomfited, and has no intention of suspending further deliveries to Iran. In any case, President Reagan has not reported any cancellation of his secret directive of 17 January, sanctioning the Iranian operation, and this means that Washington's secret interference will continue.

'Top Priority' on 'Irangate'

LD221659 Moscow in English to North America 0000 GMT 22 Nov 86

["Top Priority" program presented by Vladimir Pozner; with panelists Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov of the USA and Canada Studies Institute]

[Text] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen. This is Vladimir Pozner presenting Top Priority. With me on the panel today as usual are Drs Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov of Moscow's USA and Canada Studies Institute. Today we would like to look at a subject that is very much in the news; it's even been called the Irangate, with a hit of Watergate, as it were, the scandal involving the ex-national security adviser, Mr McFarlane, and what he was doing in Iran, and supposedly the White House not knowing what he was doing but in reality, of course, knowing all too well, which reminds us of many, many other such stories and perhaps one of the most flagrant ones concerns what was going on in Libya, with ah, the way the American press was misled, it seems, by its own government into believing all the stories that were told as a justification of the American savage attack on that country. What I'd like to ask both of you today is to answer one question to begin with and then we can also look at it in the Soviet-American relations area, but the one question I'd like you to look at first is: Is this kind of distortion of the truth, this dishonesty of the government, the White House, and even the President vis-a-vis the American people a pattern, is it something that we see on a regular basis, does it characterize the United States, or rather is this just an unfortunate accident? Dr. Bogdanov.

[Bogdanov] You know you may have several approaches to that problem, but as a student of American domestic politics for the last quarter of a century I put a question to myself when I came to know about that case should I be amazed at that or not?

[Pozner] When you say that case you mean Iran.

[Bogdanov] I mean the Iraniangate as my friend Sergey put it, Iraniangate. Should I be amazed at that or should I not? What conclusions as a student of American politics should I take because after all again it's American domestic problem and let the American public opinion judge its own administration in its own way, but I would like to have, if you like, academic view on that. So my first point is that I should not be surprised. It's -- it's very, you know, I would put it like that -- that way of doing politics is built into American political system.

If you take the history of any postwar American Administration in one way or the other you can find out almost the same thing or even more ominous you know things in that, in the politics of any American Administration. My answer to that is, as I put it already is built in the American political system. Why? You know that for instance what important part elections, election campaign takes in the American political. Way? When you hear to the so-called negative campaigning of candidates, even presidential candidates, when you hear all these ominous things about the counterpart you always have a question. If this fellow is so bad his place (?is) in the jail not in the running American elections, you know. That's my (?problem) So, number two, number two. You know, it doesn't mea.. if I gave this explanation, it doesn't mean that I am trying to excuse this administration. It makes the whole, the international life very difficult for everybody. They forget at the American end that they are operating within the system of international relations. The world is a very small one now, it's interlinked. Though it seems a very American problem, you know, to liberate, to liberate hostages paying this price of supplying, you know, arms to the state, but its an international problem, you know; they're creating difficulties for everybody.

[Pozner] I'd like to go back to something you began with and I would like to ask you, Dr Plekhanov, whether you are in agreement. Your colleague here made a rather harsh statement when he said that he felt this kind of hanky-panky is built in to the American political system, and if we're going to call a spade a spade this is actually a systematic way of misinforming or lying to the American public. Now, do you agree that it's built in, and if you do I'd like you to bolster your view with some concrete evidence of that.

[Plekhanov] Well I agree that it is built into political system, it's built into the way foreign policy, especially the way foreign policy is made in the United States. Now lying about other people's, other nation's, intentions and designs has been endemic, I mean in the world history. When you want to built up hostility for your neighbor you start propagating bad things about him. So, in the American case I think the rank-and-file people have been especially susceptible to misinformation about other nations because of the traditional isolationist impulse in the American psyche. America has been separated, had been separated from the rest of the world by two oceans, had felt secure, had had a special regard for its mission in the world and always felt that it was its duty to teach others how to live. And so it was always easy, I think, to tell the American people that, well you there are those evil states way over there and we must change them from the better, we must apply pressure to them, we must do this and that. So I think that Americans have been more, I mean at least it has been easier to lie to Americans about foreign affairs than perhaps to any other country, to many Europeans.

[Pozner] Have you got any concrete examples you might cite?

[Plekhanov] Oh, there are thousands of examples. One of the cases that comes to mind is the campaign of 1960, and that had to do with plans to invite Cuba. The CIA started preparations for an invasion of Cuba in 1959 and Vice President Nixon, who was then vice president, was in charge of the preparations. Now Nixon was running for election, to become president, and John Kennedy, Senator Kennedy, was running as a Democrat, and Kennedy, of course, knew that the invasion was being prepared but he also knew that it was being done secretly and nobody would discuss it openly so he brought it into the open. He started lambasting the Republican administration for being soft on Castro, soft on communism, said, how can they tolerate the existence of this communist state 90 miles off the shores of Florida? And Nixon was of course furious because he was in charge of an attempt to do away with that threat. But Nixon had to defend himself and he started lamblasting Kennedy for being irresponsible.

He said how can you even talk about such a thing as deposing a sovereign state. That will be a violation of international law. Meanwhile, the same Nixon, being in charge of the preparation for the invasion, was trying to speed things up so that the invasion take place before the election day because he thought that that would have a favorable impact on the voting.

[Pozner] So you're saying basically that the Cuban, that particular aspect of American-Cuban relations is part of a pattern where we have, as I said, the Tonkin Gulf incident, where we have the U-2 incident with Eisenhower saying that there were no spy planes flying over the Soviet Union, and being forced to admit that there were, and of course the way in Vietnam. The way it was explained to the American people.

[Bodganov, interrupting] Tremendous life story as a whole.

[Pozner] So we're talking about a pattern. Is that correct? Well, I'd like to ask you this before we move on to another aspect of it. Um, how do you account for the fact that on the one hand Americans tend to be cynical and tend to talk about their own government using the pronoun they, they? We can't trust the government, you know, you can't trust those guys, but every time one of these things comes out into the open and they see that indeed you can't trust them, they seem to be shocked. How do these things -- I mean either they believe them or they don't. What do you think is happening in the American minds?

[Bogdanov] You know I would prefer to explain all that by the American history you know, by pattern of historical behavior of American electorate, let's put it that way, of American electorate. You know, I believe that this belongs to the tradition of American politics. When the President, rather the President and the government, doing some, you know, foreign policy business, Americans tend to gather around him just to support him. They like him or dislike him. It's a kind of patriotic, you know.

[Pozner] They rally around him.

[Bogdanov] They rally around him, they may not like him they may know he is lying or doing wrong things but he's American President and they have to support him. But they never, you know; they never think what price they will have to pay later on or in the near future for that kind of rallying around. That's my point, that's my point. Maybe you will add something else to that, Sergey.

[Plekhanov] Yes, I think there is a paradox. Nixon said openly to the American people: I'm not a crook, when everybody, oh many people suspected that he was. Everybody sneered at that: Oh, how can you say such a thing? Then came Jimmy Carter who said I will never lie to you, lie to the American people. Later he added a caveat knowingly which was I think an invitation to his assistant [words indistinct] to think that he is telling the truth. But I mean everybody also said: Oh, how can he say that. Now when Reagan became President, what he did was: Russians are liars and cheats and everybody applauded because he really took the onus off America as such and said we may lie but there are worse liars than us, let's talk about them, and there is something in the human psyche when people started telling you that you're very good but the other guy's bad. That's always appealing, and I think that's also had a role.

[Pozner] I'd like us to look at another aspect of all of this. As you know, the Soviet Union has not been testing any nuclear weapons for well over a year now, and you also know that this kind of information has really not gotten to Americans, or gotten there very slowly, very gradually. Just as the real estate of affairs insofar as SDI is concerned, what it really means, what it really stands for. Would you say that in that sense that the media in the United States can also play a very misleading role and it's also a pattern? Why, on the one hand, does the media seem to be very active in showing shortcomings and even catching the President on what seems to be a bit of a lie? But in this other area the media seem to be playing the same game.

[Bogdanov] Yes, Vladimir, I wouldn't like to quarrel with American mass media. I have a number of friends among top American journalists; but I'm always telling them, oh, guys, if you're really representing the so-called objective democratic free press, you should be free to publish the truth. I mean, what's going on at the other side. That's where the whole story begins, you know, and my experience is that the same American guys, you know, a feeling, a spirit of, you know, of terror among them if they publish something which is, you know, favorable to the Soviet Union that would be taken by this administration as a sign of unloyalty to them. So you, you, you feel a kind of revival of McCarthyist way, that's number one. Number two, you know, mass media is serving the basic interests of American ruling classes, (?reporting), you know, and what is not in the interest of that ruling class, they, they just don't take...

[Pozner, interrupting] You know, Americans would never agree with you when you say that. They don't even believe that there is a ruling class.

[Bogdanov] Yes, that's very old, you know, dispute between us and the Americans but since you asked me...

[Pozner, interrupting] That's your opinion...

[Bogdnanov] I am a Soviet student of that so I am expresing, naturally, not American views on that but Soviet views on that, you know.

[Pozner] Dr Plekhanov, what about you? What do you feel about this, the way the media acts as a [word indistinct]

[Plekhanov] I think there is another thing which prevents the media from giving an accurate picture of anything and that is its constant desire to appeal to all parts of the viewing public, whether they be liberals or conservatives. It tries to give both sides of the story and on the surface that sounds like an objective, truthful thing to do but in practice what it boils down to is virtually producing bland stories. For instance, Americans have forgotten how to produce good documentary films. The Britons do very good documentaries because their television is run on a somewhat different basis. The Americans, they give a bland story about almost anything, they give an opportunity to, they talk about the one side of the story, they talk about the other side of the story, and the result that comes across is very muddling, I would say.

[Pozner] So, I would like to ask you: Do you believe that there is a deliberate attempt at any part -- not only the government's, because that's something we already seem to have established, but the media's as well -- not to inform the American public about certain things or to misinform the American public about certain things? Would you say that does exist of not?

[Plekhanov] Well, of course, there is a deliberate policy on the part of the media to portray the Soviet Union in very distorting terms. People have studied in a systematic way, for instance, the policies of the major news magazines, the kind of news that they pick out, the way they slant the news; the way even they combine the pictures, you know. There was an interesting study of what pictures do, the visual images of a story.

[Pozner] Final question then, before we finish for today. Do you think, both of you or separately, do you feel that the American establishment has a kind of disdain, scorn for the average American, and that this is reflected in the way that different administrations at different times have deliberately hidden the truth, lied to their constituents?

[Bogdanov] You know, I still can repeat what I have already said. It's inbuilt, it's, you know, integral part of American politics. That should be taken that way.

[Pozner] What about you, Dr Plekhanov?

[Plekhanov] Well, I believe that there is a ruling class, and I believe that the ruling class in the United States is very much afraid of the truth about U.S. foreign policy being told to the American people. There was an interesting definition of democracy which a Chicago businessman gave a couple of years ago -- I saw it in a newspaper -- he said: There are two greatest impediments to democracy in the United States. One is the delusion on the part of a large majority of American people that they do have a democracy, and a very strong fear on the part of a privileged minority of the American people that the people may get a democracy.

[Pozner] So much for government for, of and by the people. We'll be back a week from today at the same time and we invite you to tune in to Top Priority. Until next time, we wish you all good listening.

PROGRAM ON DEMOCRATIC SENATE GAINS

LD212351 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2116 GMT 21 Nov 86

[From "The World Today" program, presented by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Text] Washington -- The election of a new leadership of the U.S. Senate took place on Capitol Hill today. This ceremony has formally consolidated the Democrats' victory in the recent elections which gave them control over the upper house of the U.S. Congress after being in opposition for 6 years. Addressing the Republicans, President Reagan sadly stated: We are in a minority again. He then carried on with forced optimism: We can be proud of our achievements -- individual achievements as well as those we achieved together.

But the American voters see no reason why they should be enthusiastic over the imaginary achievements of the Republicans. This was clearly demonstrated by the failures of the policies of the Reagan administration.

TASS EXAMINES REAGAN'S REMARKS ON RELIGION

LD221533 Moscow TASS in English 1500 GMT 22 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 22 TASS -- By TASS political news analyst Anatoliy Krasikov

Whenever Mr. Reagan delivers a speech, he always mentions his religious feelings. Meanwhile it follows from all his deeds that in reality he worships only the god of war and the embodiment of that god on earth -- the military-industrial complex.

Delivering the other day as a speech in the Ethics and Public Policy Center, Reagan again made calls for a "crusade" against the USSR and other socialist countries. "We face today a challenge to our Judeo-Christian ethic, to our belief that man is a creature of God," the President orated. "It is in our interest to stand with those who would take arms against the sea of darkness," he declaimed.

Reagan's words make one recall the bleakest medieval times, the times of "witchhunt" and inquisition. The latter-day "crusader" has lost sight of one thing: that in the present nuclear age his efforts to be a greater Catholic than the Pope (or a greater Judaist than the Rabbi of the Washington Synagogue) are next to playing the fool or to sheer madness.

The current U.S. leadership has long been trying to condition the American people little by little to the idea that the nuclear apocalypse is inevitable. In the course of 1980-1983, Reagan declared at least five times that the Armageddon might come in the life-time of the present generation. As THE WASHINGTON POST wrote on April 8, 1984, Reagan holds that his career is God-governed.

The spirit of "crusade" which Reagan advocates is rejected by virtually all modern religions. It is a glaring contradiction to the decisions of the Second Vatican Council and the latest session of the Bishops' Synod of the Roman Catholic Church. The World Council of Churches, the Lutheran World Federation, the World Fellowship of Buddhists and other international religious organizations have unambiguously declared against "crusades" and against the arms race.

The American Catholic bishops also assumed an anti-war stance. On an instruction from Reagan, presidential ambassador for special missions Vernon Walters made a trip to the Vatican in October 1982. THE WASHINGTON POST wrote that Vernon Walters had made that trip to try to convince the Pope to declare against the document of American Catholic bishops that was then being drafted, the document that called in question the moral aspect of the legality of using nuclear arms.

Those efforts proved futile. A pastoral letter of the national conference of Catholic bishops in the USA was adopted at the National Conference's Council in May 1983 in Chicago. The Pastoral letter said that to start nuclear war in any form meant to perform a deed which could not be justified from a viewpoint of morality.

Pope John Paul the Second had a meeting with U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger in Florence in the second half of October of this year. The Italian press wrote those days that the Pope had asked Weinberger to convey to the President of the United States his view that the hopes kindled by the Soviet-U.S. meetings in Geneva and Reykjavik must be fulfilled. Talking with young Italians in the state of Florence the Pope condemned the squandering of huge funds and resources which could destroy all life on earth during the continued arms race.

A few days later the Pope invited most prominent clergymen of various denominations to gather for a prayer for peace in Assisi.

Reagan holds the opposite viewpoint. By all indications he sincerely believes that the history of humanity started the day he was born and it deserves to end the day he expires.

REAGAN MEETS WITH HAITIAN LEADER 21 Nov

LD221647 Moscow TASS in English 1126 GMT 22 Nov 86

[Text] Washington November 22 TASS -- By TASS Correspondent Igor Ignatiyev

President Ronald Reagan yesterday met with Lieutenant-General Henry Namphy, head of the Haitan regime. The White House statement, released after the talks, said that the sides discussed "the political and economic situation" in Haiti, "devoting particular attention" to the U.S. assistance programme.

Namphey's trip to the U.S. coincided with mass disturbances in Haiti. A one week-long strike by transport workers has virtually paralyzed life on the island.

According to reports from Haiti, streets of the nation's capital, Port-au-Prince, are being patrolled by armed units on armoured cars.

At least two people have been killed in clashes with security forces.

Under these conditions, the U.S. is applying vigorous efforts to keep afloat and buttress the regime of its stooge. Namphy came to power after dictator Jean-Claude Duvalier fled the island in February this year.

In the current financial year, the administration is planning to provide the Haitian authorities with more than 100 million dollars.

The reception of the head of the Haitian regime at the White House was designed to demonstrate that it enjoys the Washington Administration's political support.

GORBACHEV INTERVIEWED BY INDIAN JOURNALISTS

LD240010 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 23 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast, interview with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev by Indian journalists Naqvi, Balu, Joglekar and Avashti in the Kremlin on 21 November -- recorded; Indian journalists' questions in English with superimposed Russian translation; journalists not identified on screen; video shows Gorbachev in conversation with journalists around table; Gorbachev is accompanied by Academician Ye. Primakov and two unidentified men]

[Text] [Gorbachev] First I would like to say that I am awaiting my meeting with India with great interest. It will be my first visit to India. But perhaps that is not the most important thing about it. The most important thing is that Soviet people have a special attitude toward India. In the Indian people we see our old friend and reliable partner. We are satisfied with how our relations are taking shape. I have already had occasion to say, and I wish to say yet again: Relations with India occupy a priority position in our foreign policy. I believe we can say that the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and of the Soviet leadership as regards India also takes into account the deep friendly feelings that our peoples have for the Indian people.

We, on the other hand, constantly sense in the policies of the Indian Government an aspiration to reflect to deep feelings toward our people that exist in Indian society, in the Indian people. In my opinion these are the most important and durable things for our relations: tradition, friendship, friendship of many years' standing, and cooperation, cooperation in bilateral affairs and in international affairs.

Finally, there is a legal basis for these relations such as the 1971 treaty. Today I would like to say something about the great importance for the development of these relations both in the past and at present -- and I hope this will also be so in the future -- of the constant, intensive and constructive political dialogue in progress between the leaders of our countries.

No doubt Lenin had in mind esteem for the Indian people when he valued highly and when he predicted with especial insight India's role in international affairs. This Leninist thought provided fertile soil for our policy and practical actions toward India. Many generations of Soviet and Indian leaders did good work for us and you to be able today to see our relations in such a state.

I want to recall Jawaharlal Nehru. We deeply honor his memory and highly evaluate his contribution to the formation of our relations. The very fact that the Soviet Union and India, representing the world of socialism on the one hand and world of national liberation and the world of development [on the other], have been fruitfully cooperating for many years.

Thus, I am looking forward to my meeting with India. Now I would like to end my short address to Indian listeners, readers and television viewers by cordially greeting them on behalf of all the peoples of the Soviet Union, and by saying once again that I look forward to my meeting with India.

Now let us get down to work.

[Unidentified Indian journalist] Mr Gorbachev, we followed with great interest your itinerary from Geneva to Reykjavik. These are landmarks of a sort. How do you see the road ahead?

[Gorbachev] You have asked the most important question, about which we are all concerned. I think a year has passed since our meeting in Geneva. I am now convinced that Geneva was very important. Geneva made it possible to restore the interrupted political dialogue between leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States. This alone is very important. When there is a dialogue, there is a better understanding of each other's position. When there is a dialogue, the search continues. In any case this is the first positive thing that can be attributed to Geneva.

There were important accords there. I am referring to the final document. In it it was said: Nuclear war is inadmissible, there can be no winners in it. This is a very important political statement. This is a reply to all those who dream or at least concede the possibility of small, limited, local nuclear wars. So, if the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States admit that nuclear war is inadmissible, this is a very important starting point for the formulation of a new policy that corresponds to the nuclear space age.

There was also another important statement there: Neither side would strive for military superiority. So, if one adheres to this accord, too, then in any case both sides have to think not how to achieve military superiority but how, on an equal basis, to deal with disarmament questions.

The Soviet leadership has been faithful to the obligations undertaken in Geneva.

I want to confirm this with some facts. It is important to say something about this, because they have not lost their significance to this day.

After Geneva we extended the moratorium. On 15 January we proposed to the whole world a broad program worked out for 15 years for a stage-by-stage reduction of nuclear weapons and thereafter eliminating them by the year 2000. Apart from this, our proposals after Geneva contained very important ideas, in our view, on other issues of the struggle against the arms race as well. I am thinking of Stockholm: We put forward some very important and constructive proposals there. This made it possible to conclude this important forum successfully. We put forward major solutions which seriously moved things forward in preparations concerned with working out accords between the countries on banning and eliminating chemical weapons.

All this was after Geneva.

Finally, in summer of this year major proposals on reducing conventional arms and troops were submitted by us jointly with the other socialist countries. Even what I have cited is sufficient to confirm tht the Soviet leadership acted responsibly after Geneva. But as regards nuclear weapons and the reduction of the nuclear arms race there have been no real shifts. Basically, they have reached deadlock. But we have acted constructively and responsibly in this situation as well. Taking into account the situation that has arisen in Geneva -- the situation of deadlock, I'll say it again -- I suggested to the President that we meet without delay, leaving all other matters behind. What more important matters can there be, if what we are talking about is the fate of the world and the fate of human civilization!

It was essential to assess everything taking place in Geneva and to give these talks a new impetus in order to shift this whole process, the Geneva process from its standstill.

I must say -- we have evaluated this appropriately -- that President Reagan accepted the proposal. This, too, is important in its own right. We do not wish the Soviet Union alone to take the credit for everything. The meeting would not have taken place if there had not been the agreement and the desire for the meeting on the part of U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

After the end of the meeting in Reykjavik -- and you know how it ended -- at the press conference I said: For all the dramatic nature of this meeting, for all its dramatic outcome, this meeting led us into new areas of understanding of issues and, above all, it has shown in a real way that accords, even on these difficult issues are possible. I reaffirmed this now. This constitutes the most important significance of Reykjavik.

I regret that our partners are causing confusion and muddle in people's minds not only in the United States but throughout the world with respect to the results of Reykjavik. This disappoints me. But it appears that the President is not free in making his decisions, nor, indeed, is the present administration.

I said, and I want to repeat it: Let the United States have pause for thought; let it weigh everything; let it make a responsible decision.

All our proposals remain in force. But we want -- and here I want to answer the second part of your question -- as far as the results of Reykjavik are concerned we want to go further, forward. The opportunities for this exist, they have opened up, the whole world has seen this and the world wants this. But we are being dragged backward. Dragged backward from Reykjavik. The U.S. Administration has even forgotten altogether what was discussed, or rather, gives the appearance that the discussion in Reykjavik was about something else.

But I have to say that in European countries also politicians have been discovered who have taken fright at such a speedy and powerful advance by the Soviet Union and the United States in the search for accords both on strategic missiles and on medium-range missiles. Now they again want to return to the whole thing that spoiled -- well, not spoiled, but at any rate rendered ineffective -- the Geneva talks. As we understand it, our -- the Soviet Union's, the Soviet leadership's -- main task is to retain the entire positive aspect of Reykjavik, and to complete the building, the bricks, which were deposited in Reykjavik.

[Unidentified journalist] It is claimed in certain circles that SDI is of such great, such crucial significance for the development of American science and technology, that it simply will not be the subject of negotiations. This is not my opinion, but that is what they are asserting and thinking in some influential circles. What is your assessment of this?

[Gorbachev] In general, every new weapon to some extent advances technical equipment and technology. This, I believe, is elementary. But I want to pose the issue differently. Let us think of the cost which the United States and the world must pay for the technological achievements which the present administration is expecting to gain by opening up a new stage of the arms race in space and by setting out to create [sozdaniye] space weapons which could bring the world to the brink of unpredictable consequences.

Can you, representatives of India, really agree to this? All right-thinking mankind cannot agree to such a price for the sake of the achievement by American industry and science of some technological heights.

Is it really impossible to attain these same technological and technical, scientific heights by carrying out a program of the peaceful harnessing of space? That is what we propose, the Soviet Union, and we have put it forward at the United Nations. Let's do it; let's ensure a technological leap forward; let's ensure that we reach new technical and scientific frontiers through the peaceful mastery of space.

We are capable of making a competent judgement about all of this. To a certain extent we are on first-name terms with space; we have been working there for a long time now, and this includes cooperation between ourselves and India.

Well, if this is so, if it is possible to make technological achievements and to reach new frontiers in technology and technical equipment through the peaceful use of space and through mastering it upon a basis of international cooperation, then the question arises: Wherein, then, lies the real interest of the U.S. Administration in SDI, in the SDI project? Here it's not a question of technology at all. This is known by an enormous number of scientists both in the United States and throughout the world.

The U.S. Administration and the military-industrial circles of the United States once again want to overtake us, to break out, to achieve military superiority through space. As, I think Johnson once said: The nation that holds sway in space will hold sway on earth too. Politicians and representatives of the military-industrial complex are crazy about this. Herein lies the main question. This is something that we cannot agree to. Nor do I think that anyone can agree to it. If they try to present the SDI package in such a way as to make it appear that the United States will get the benefit here, that it will retain its technological and technical superiority over others, that this will bring benefit to the economy and ultimately to the people, then this is deception. But it's not just deception but the main obstacle on the path toward those accords to which we were moving in Reykjavik.

Thus, militarily SDI is a new stage in the arms race, it is moving on to new types of weapons, to space weapons. It is clear that this will not reduce international tension but will intensify it even more. Politically, if the SDI program is implemented, then what sense is there at all in holding talks? Who will agree to easing the task of the military-industrial complex and the adventurists of militarism?

All this will make talks more complicated. SDI destabilizes the strategic situation and will not strengthen confidence, but rather will undermine it still further, will sow suspicions and uncertainty. It is a situation in which precipitate decisions may be made. This is why both the Americans and the whole world community have to weigh everything about where SDI is pushing the world.

Finally, the economic aspect of SDI is of no small importance. SDI is a truly voracious being, a monster. According to U.S. data a minimum of $1 trillion will be spent on it, and according to other data something like $2 trillion. This will hit the United States; this will hit those countries which will be forced also to take part in this race. Ultimately, the problems and needs of the developing world will remain all the same. These are crying needs. It seems to me that the American people themselves, the Soviet people and the world community should reject this plan.

We are not afraid of SDI. We have considered what we have to do if the Americans continue with SDI. But this will not be our choice. The United States is pushing the world towards unpredictable consequences. The world should know this.

We greatly value India's stance. I have to say that the voice of peace-loving India in these last months of the acute struggle for where the world will go is a factor of enormous significance and is something of great value.

We know and value the position of the "Delhi Six." Incidentally, I want to say that we have received all their addresses and have given a reply to them. The Soviet Union shares the alarm of India, of all the "Delhi Six," and is willing to work together in the search for solutions to these urgent problems.

[Unidentified journalist] In your television statement of 22 October and in Mr Shevardnadze's recent statements there was a note of hope -- and optimism despite the U.S. Administration's attempts to depart from Reykjavik and to cause confusion, and despite the complicated situation. But I would say that your tone today was somewhat more disappointed. Am I correct? Today you are angrier, more indignant than even quite recently.

[Gorbachev] By my tone I wanted to convey my alarm. My standpoint remains the same. Like all my colleagues in the Soviet leadership, I am very concerned that the real results of Reykjavik should not in fact be drowned in a flood of all kinds of minor debates of little significance which have the aim not of leading this process on to a direct route toward a better world but of muddling the minds of the world public and of diminishing the results of the meeting. It is this disquiet that determines my tone. But we are incorrigible optimists. We are dedicated to the peace-loving line and will do a great deal more in order for this process to be preserved and to promote it. However, as they say, a bridge has to be built from both sides.

[Unidentified journalist] You speak of the need for new thinking and for fresh approaches in international politics. We study these statements of yours with great interest. For instance, your speech in Vladivostok. How is this manifested in the USSR's policies in Asia?

[Gorbachev] An interesting question, an important one of great significance. Our new thinking as we understand it, is based on the realities of the present age. We are all in the same boat. The nuclear space age has faced all of us, not just some individual countries, with the problem of the preservation and the survival of mankind.

This is our common problem. In connection with this, in our foreign policy we appeal to the whole international community. This is our common task: to protect human civilization from nuclear catastrophe.

Or take ecological problems. They have now assumed their full significance. These are also problems that can be solved only on the basis of the cooperation of all countries. The problems of poverty, underdevelopment, backwardness, moreover, affect whole continents of the earth. They cannot remain ignored and unsolved.

I think that without the active participation in the process of construction of new international relations and by the peoples and countries of such a vast continent as Asia, this is unrealistic. For Asia consists of India, China and the Soviet Union and billions of people, many peoples and states.

Incidentally, after exchanging opinions with Mr Rajiv Ghandi, with whom I have talked on these themes on two occasions, it seems to me that between us there is this understanding: that however difficult this process is in Asia, and it is certainly not easy -- nothing must be oversimplified. One must not imagine it is an easy stroll. It is necessary to develop on this continent the search for new solutions along the whole front. We tried to express our own ideas about this in the Vladivostok speech. We are now intensifying political dialogue with a large number of countries of the Asiatic region. Of course, we count on the the great contribution of India and also on cooperation with it in these matters. We are conveying our ideas concerning the Asian process also to China, and we have a dialogue with small and medium-sized states.

We recognize the right of all countries to an independent choice, to determine their fate, political system and state structure. This has to be the starting point. We strive to see that our foreign policy in the Asian region is built on these principles. At the moment we are taking steps to increase and expand economic cooperation and cultural ties, to make them dynamic. Of course, there are regional problems. We want a political solution and settlement to be found for them. On the whole, in my opinion, this will be a very difficult and long progress, but it is necessary.

[Unidentified journalist] Mr General Secretary, we are conducting this interview with you on the eve of your visit to Delhi. Could you now dwell on Indian-Soviet relations? How would you evaluate Indian-Soviet relations and their development since the time of Jawahalal Nehru? How do they affect world politics in the present-day situation?

[Gorbachev] To some extent I have already touched on this question in the beginning of my message to the Indian people. But I am ready to add to what has already been said: It is a subject which constantly preoccupies us and which is at the focus of our foreign policy activity.

Actually, relations between the Soviet Union and India are of immense value in themselves, not only for our two peoples, but for the whole world as well. I have said that we are pleased with these relations. In fact, we have a very active political dialogue that is very rich in content, in the spirit of deep mutual understanding. This has been characteristic of the whole period beginning with Jawahalal Nehru. I am very pleased that such an active dialogue, rich in content, is continuing at the moment between the present leaders of the Soviet Union and India. I think that we have reason for saying today that our cooperation in the sphere of economics and trade is also an important sphere of Soviet-Indian relations. At the moment I don't want to go into figures and specifics. But over all these years following the declaration of India's independence we have been cooperating, and cooperating fruitfully, in the sphere of economics. Dozens of enterprises are living monuments to this cooperation and the best argument in favor of its effectiveness. Thanks to them, India is today resolving many tasks facing the country. Prospects are now opening up for cooperation in the power-engineering sphere.

Major programs in the sphere of information and computer technology and machine-building are being implemented in the USSR. This will also expand opportunities for cooperation with India. Yes, we will also decide a thing or two in this respect during my visit. I shall not divulge anything now for the time being.

We have always treated with great respect the struggle of the Indian people for their self-rule and independence, have supported their peace-loving policy and have always shared their cares for the strengthening of the defense capability of your country.

Our scientific and technological links, cultural contacts and tourism are developing widely. This brings peoples together and gives them broad opportunity to pool experience and share their cultures.

Certain problems have arisen in trade turnover and trade, but now both the Soviet and Indian sides are acting constructively and the trade turnover will increase.

I think our cooperation, and Soviet-Indian relations in general, have a good future. For us there is no question of how to build relations with India. We see India as our great friend, and we value its enormous contribution to the world process in all spheres.

[Unidentified journalist] Mr General Secretary, I should like to dwell on the Soviet-Indian Friendship Treaty, which was signed 15 years ago. Do you view this treaty as important in the light of the present-day international situation?

[Gorbachev] Yes, I think this treaty and its signficance extend beyond the bounds of Soviet-Indian relations.

Of course, when we signed the treaty of friendship with your country we were thinking primarily of the interests of the Soviet Union and India. That is quite understandable. But at the same time, the development of cooperation on the basis of this treaty and the boundaries we have reached during implementation of the provisions of this important document give us the possibility to say today that these relations -- and that means the Soviet-Indian cooperation treaty itself -- are a good example for other countries. Now, when we are talking about the search for ways to improve the international situation, and about the strengthening of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems, such an example of cooperation, such an example of relations between states is a great asset common to all mankind.

We have been cooperating very fruitfully for so many years, and neither have we lost our independence because of this cooperation, nor has India lost or given up any of its independence in any way. But we have gained a lot. The most important thing is that our relations have become a powerful factor of international politics.

The treaty: this is not history, this is also the present day, this is the living practice of our days, of our time.

[Unidentified journalist] You have spoken of Soviet-Indian relations. But I would like to know what you propose to offer for closer economic and scientific cooperation between our two countries?

[Gorbachev] Let you and me reserve this question for Delhi. When we have discussed everything with Mr Gandhi we shall come and tell you what we have agreed, what to do next. We shall not anticipate our talks. It will be all the more interesting for you if both sides state simultaneously what we have agreed on. I hope you will be at the press conference, and let us agree here with you that you will pose this question.

[Unidentified journalist] At the 27th CPSU Congress you spoke of the intention of the Soviet to leave Afghanistan. Then in Vladivostok you announced the withdrawal of a certain part of the Soviet troops. How do you see the situation in Afghanistan at this moment in time?

[Gorbachev] I shall immediately say that we have always had good and friendly relations with Afghanistan under all regimes and under all governments. These are being maintained now, too.

There are two points of principle from the basis of our attitude toward Afghanistan now as in the past: This is a neighboring country with which we have 2,500 kms of common border. Of course, one must always live on good terms with one's neighbors. That is elementary. Second, these people, implementing their own choice, have embarked on the path of reform. They have the right to do this. Neither you nor we can refuse them that. I see no reason to change our attitude toward Afghanistan, when it has taken the path of reform. Events there are not developing simply. Both we and you know the reasons, I think.

We are in favor of a political settlement surrounding Afghanistan. The Afghan Government is similarly disposed. It keeps up contacts with us and exchanges opinions. What is being done under the UN aegis -- I have in mind the mission of UN Under Secretary General Cordovez -- is a realistic process. It can come to a successful conclusion and result in a political settlement, if, of course, both Pakistan and the United States are in favor of a political settlement. As soon as some progress takes place in a settlement, immediately measures are taken by them to frustrate it. Nevertheless I think that the day is not far off when the question of a political settlement of the situation surrounding Afghanistan will be solved. This will also mean, at the same time, a solution of the question of the withdrawal of our troops from Afghanistan.

We are in favor of a nonaligned, independent Afghanistan. I want to say once again: We have no expansionist designs with regard to Afghanistan. This must be absolutely clear to the whole world. I hope that both the Indian Government and the Indian people have an understanding of our position recording Afghanistan, both today and in the future.

[Unidentified journalist] Tremendous interest is now being displayed throughout the world in the changes which you are carrying out in the Soviet Union. In a number of statements you have described these changes as being tantamount to revolution. Do you think you could go into more detail on this?

As a rider to this fairly broad question, I should like to say the following: Yesterday I learned that the Supreme Soviet has adopted a law on individual labor activity. On what level does your current economic policy differ from the new economic policy conducted by Lenin? To what degree do you derive a model from it?

[Gorbachev] Socialism brought our country up to a level at which it now is. This is a modern country, which has solved many questions on the basis of socialist transformations, a country possessing tremendous potential to continue successfully its progress, to develop its economy, to solve social questions and questions relations between nationalities, to have a reliable defense and make a contribution to the building of international relations.

We are content with our territory. It is sufficient for us, although we have none to spare either. We have a very united people, with a very developed sense of patriotism and pride, because what has been done in the country today has been done by the people.

But we are dissatisfied with what we have. Primarily because we can do more. Why? We have created a mighty economic potential. We have a mighty science, perhaps the mightiest in the world.

I have no wish to boast, but that is not even my view but that which prevails in the world. We have a good cadre potential. We believe that a new major set, a leap forward, might be taken through the use of these possibilities and the possibilities of the socialist planned economy, which provides enough room for implementing the necessary maneuver in the interests of structural policy and scientific and technical progress, in determining the right proportions and priorities, in developing the social sphere of the society, that is, by using the socialist system. I think that we became a little too relaxed. Elements of complacency and inertia emerged.

We assessed it all at our congress. That was the right thing to do. Dissatisfaction with what we have, with the way our economy, our political institution and socialist democracy functioned, dissatisfaction with the atmosphere in collectives, were already felt in society itself.

Our main idea is through scientific and technical progress, in association with planned economy, and through democratization of society, to set it in motion, to ensure that society reaches new frontiers.

Very serious programs in the sphere of scientific-technical progress have already been compiled and are being implemented in our country. They embrace all industries. We give priority to engineering and computer technology and are changing structure policy. But the way we include man, the working man, in this process will be of crucial importance for the fate of our plans and of our policy; that is the main thing. In the economic structure we want to do this through financial autonomy, through the self-management of production collectives, through extending the selection of leading cadres by means of elections, and through the new economic mechanism. A new law about the enterprise is nearing completion. We will submit it to nationwide discussion. The way the economy is to function in the present conditions will be laid down in it. The main direction here is the democratization of production life, the greater independence of labor collectives and their greater responsibility.

This approach is being welcomed by the Soviet people. The process is already under way.

Furthermore, we want the political system, including the organs of local soviet power, social organizations, the trade unions, the Komosoml, women's organizations and others to function more effectively.

We are also thinking of putting the human factor into operation by means of greatly altering social policy in the interests of the working people. I would say that now the strengthening of social policy is now for us the key to solving many issues in society.

I must say that restructuring is not progressing smoothly. The most important obstacle is in [people's] thinking. What is needed is the restructuring of a mentality that has taken whole years to take shape. We are creating such economic, social, political and ideological preconditions that enables us to hope that here the process will prevail in the final analysis. We will ensure the restructuring of all spheres of society.

We attach considerable importance to questions of improving the intellectual sphere, cultural sphere and the moral atmosphere in the society. Our people have a very strong sense of justice and feel strongly about the consistent observation of the values of socialism.

This is why we are waging an uncompromising struggle against all kinds of negative phenomena, against abuses by officials, against criminal phenomena, immoral conduct, and particularly against the violation of discipline, order, and against phenomena such as hard drinking. All society is taking an active part in this. That which is new is waging a struggle against that which is old. It is taking place under the party's leadership. The work within the party itself is being perfected and restructured. Moreover, we pose the issue as follows: The entire restructuring and all processes in society have to start from the party. We now make much greater demands on Communists. Some have been satisfied with the situation as it was in the country, satisfied primarily with their position. Now we remind everyone about their duty to the people. This is immensely important. The restructuring will need time and efforts.

All that serves socialism we welcome, and we create prerequisities for the utilization of all the possibilities embodied in our system. We will also utilize more effectively all instruments of the planned economy, material stimuli and social factors and possibilities linked with the perfection of commodity-money relations. It is in this context that we adopted a law on individual labor activity. All this is in the framework of socialism. We shall go along this road. We do not waver. I think this will have vast consequences not only for our country but, taking into account its role in the world, for the whole world as well.

[Unidentified journalist] I should like to ask a question about a very important region -- the Near East. Have you any new peace initiatives for this region?

[Gorbachev] I think that the Near East is a common concern of the whole world. I want to emphasize that: a common concern. In my opinion, there has been no progress here for the reason that certain states have sought to settle the Near East situation in their own way. We now see that the policy of all kinds of roundabout maneuvers and separate deals has led to nothing good.

I think that there is now a growing understanding among the international community that it is necessary to bring this process on to an international level. I would stress the constructive nature of our proposal about the need to start preparatory work through the Security Council and through the preparatory committee with the aim of convening an international conference on the Near East. I believe there is a greater understanding now of the reality and effectiveness of such a course.

I am glad we met and that I have had the chance to share my thoughts with the Indian public in answering your questions. I believe this is a useful -- shall we say -- exercise on the eve of my visit to India. So, until we meet in Delhi. Thank you.

REPORTAGE ON GORBACHEV DEPARTURE FOR INDIA

Preparatory Group Briefs Press

LD231655 Moscow TASS in English 1639 GMT 23 Nov 86

[Text] New Delhi November 23 TASS -- TASS special correspondents Vladimir Baydashin, Aleksandr Belikov, Leonid Kotov and Gennadiy Shishkin report: The soviet information centre went into operation for the time of the official friendly visit to India by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, here today.

Albert Vlasov, first deputy head of the propaganda department of the CPSU Central Committee, Academicians Georgiy Arbatov, Yevgeniy Primakov, Roald Sagdeyev, and Valentin Falin, chairman of the NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY board, spoke to India and foreign correspondents.

They noted that the Soviet union had always attached and continued to attach great significance to its relations with India, a great power and a leader of the Non-Aligned Movement. The USSR is bound with India by the long history of close friendly ties tested by time in various situations.

In the Soviet Union's relations with other countries India holds a priority place. All this gives exceptional importance to the forthcoming top-level visit.

The speakers paid much attention to the issues of removing the nuclear threat and ending the arms race. One of the correspondents put this question: The Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions, which has already been repeatedly extended, expires approximately in a month. What are the Soviet side's plans in relations to this?

The participants in the press conference noted that for a year and four months our country has not been conducting unilaterally nuclear tests whereas the United States set off twenty three nuclear blasts over that period and is in preparation for the 24th one.

The issue how long can our country allow itself to refrain from tests at the time when the United States is going ahead with its nuclear testing programme is under serious debate in the Soviet Union. An uneasy decision is to be made. And what this decision can be largely depends on public opinion and to a no small extent on the Non-Aligned Movement.

Ending nuclear tests is the pivotal issue of disarmament since it is the basis for driving up the qualitative arms race. It was stressed that the Soviet moratorium had already had an important role to play. It dispelled a whole number of conceived myths. One of them is the fiction that nuclear tests can allegedly not be banned because this ban is unverifiable. It turned out that the fact of carrying out any tests can be established.

The joint experiement conducted by Soviet and U.S. scientists in Semipalatinsk showed that explosions with an yield as small as several hundred tonnes can be picked up. The legend that continued tests were needed to make sure existing warheads worked properly was also destroyed.

It is perfectly clear that continued tests play into the hands of only those who are bent on developing new and new types of nuclear armaments, including for waging "Star wars".

In the West they contend that the Soviet Union opposes the "Star Wars" because technologically it lags behind the United States. Is it really so, an Indian journalist queried.

It is well-known that for a definite period of time now the United States has not had the possibility to place into orbit space objects which is explained to a no small extent by the disaster which struck the U.S. spaceship "Challenger", the journalist was answered. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union developed the orbital station "Mir" which is a new-generation station after "Salyut".

The permanently operating orbital station has actually been created now, which thanks to the modular character of its design can be enlarged and acquire new configuration, which the world would be able to see for itself in the near future.

In these conditions, Academician Sagdeyev stressed, it is absurd to speak of some technical lag of the Soviet Union.

One more question: India aspires to enter the new, 21st century as a highly developed country in technological terms. What assistance can the Soviet Union extend in implementing these national aspirations of the Indian people?

Our country, Soviet delegates said, strives further to advance cooperation with brilliant Indian scientists to enter jointly the approaching century in the first ranks of scientific and technological progress. All of you know that the first Indian cosmonaut Rakesh Sharma made his space flight on board the Soviet spacecraft and worked at the Soviet orbital station.

Soviet booster-rockets were also used to launch two Indian satellites and the third one is under preparations to be lofted into space. It is not our country that imposes an embargo on the supply of high-tech products to India. In conclusion the participants in the press conferences stressed that the coming visit to India by Mikhail Gorbachev was certain to help further develop the multi-faceted Soviet-Indian relations, to make a new major contribution to forging traditional friendship and cooperation between the peoples of the USSR and India.

Gorbachev, Delegation Depart

LD241123 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0958 GMT on 24 November in the Novosti program carries a report on Soviet leader Gorbachev's departure for India. The item reports: "Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev left Moscow today for Delhi on an official friendly visit at the invitation of Rajiv Gandhi, the prime minister of India, and of the Indian Government. Comrade Shevardnadze; Comrade Dobrynin; Comrade Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Comrade Chernyayev, aide to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Marshal of the Soviet Union Akhromeyev, chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the USSR and first deputy minister of defense; and Comrade Vorontsov, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR; left with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev."

Video shows large group of people stepping away from an airport building. In the front line, as they appear left to right across the screen, are: Raisa Gorbachev; Ryzhkov; Gorbachev; Gromyko; unidentified Indian male; unidentified Indian female carrying flowers. In the rows behind them can be seen Ligachev, Solomentsev, Chebrikov and Talyzin, in a crowd. The group stops at a white line, while Gorbachev steps forward to greet a man in airline uniform.

The report continues: "At Vnukovo Airport Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was seen off by Comrades Aliyev, Vorotnikov, Gromyko, Zaykov, Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Solomentsev, Chebrikov, Demichev, Dolgikh, Yeltsin, Sokolov, Talyzin, Biryukova, Zimyanin, Medvedev, Nikonov, Razumovskiy, Yakovlev, and other comrades. Among those who saw him off was (Bhatnagan), charge d'affaires ad interim of the Republic of India of the USSR and diplomatic staff of the Indian Embassy." The video then shows Gorbachev shaking hands with Gromyko, Chebrikov, and Sokolov; Gorbachev and Raisa walk to the aircraft steps and enter the aircraft; the seeing-off party waves, and the aircraft is seen taking off.

TASS ISSUES WARNING ON PLANNED PACIFIC TESTS

LD211819 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1746 GMT 21 Nov 86

["TASS Announcement" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 21 Nov (TASS) -- Launches of carrier rockets will be effected in the Soviet Union in the period from 25 November through 30 November 1986:

In the region of the Pacific Ocean, within an area having a radius of 30 nautical miles of coordinates 22 degrees 35 minutes north, and 174 degrees 10 minutes east;

In the region of the Pacific Ocean, within an area having a radius of 25 nautical miles of the coordinates 19 degrees 10 minutes north, and 174 degrees 45 minutes east;

TASS is authorized to state that in order to ensure safety, the Government of the USSR requests the governments of other states using maritime and air routes in the Pacific Ocean to give instructions to the relevant bodies that vessels and aircraft should not enter these regions and the airspace above them each day from 1000 until 2300 local time.

PRAVDA REPORTS ALIYEV MEETS IN VIENTIANE

PM181649 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS reports under general heading "Meetings in Vientiane"]

[Text] Vientiane, 15 Nov -- CPSU delegation head G.A. Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, yesterday met with Soviet specialists working in the Lao People's Democratic Republic [LPDR] and giving fraternal assistance to Lao working people in developing the economy and culture and building major national economic projects.

Vientiane, 15 Nov -- A meeting took place here today between the heads of the CPSU and Kampuchean Peoples' Revolutionary Party [KPRP] delegations taking part in the work of the Fourth Lao People's Revolutionary Party [LPRP] Congress -- G.A. Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Heng Samrin, general secretary of the KPRP Central Committee and chairman of the PRK Council of State.

Some questions of the international situation and of Soviet-Cambodian relations were touched upon in the course of the conversation, which was held in a warm friendly atmosphere.

G.A. Aliyev confirmed the Soviet Union's solidarity with the Cambodian people's struggle for the country's socialist restructuring, in defense of national sovereignty, and with the efforts made by the Indochina countries aimed at the transformation of Southeast Asia into a zone of peace, stability, and cooperation.

Heng Samrin declared the total support of the PRK party and government for the constructive stance taken by the Soviet Union at the Reykjavik meeting and for the Soviet proposal to include the Asia-Pacific region in the general process of creating an all-embracing system of international security.

Members of the CPSU and KPRP delegations took part in the meeting.

On the same day the CPSU delegation visited the Vientiane polytechnical college named for Lao-Soviet friendship. The first group of future power industry workers and geologists recently started studying in this major education center built to Soviet plans and with technical assistance from the Soviet Union. The delegation members toured the lecture auditoriums and laboratories and conversed with students and teachers, many of whom have been educated at Soviet VUZ's. The polytechnical college continues to expand. Its complex, in addition to educational premises and hostels, will also contain a stadium and a cultural center.

A friendship meeting was held in the assembly hall. Addressing the meeting, G.A. Aliyev emphasized that this polytechnical college is a tangible manifestation of USSR-LPDR friendship and fruitful cooperation, and expressed confidence that its graduates will be good specialists and will make a fitting contribution to the building of socialism on Lao soil.

Bountiem Phitsamai, LPDR minister of education, sports, and fine arts affairs [title as published], expressed profound gratitude to the Soviet friends for their assistance in training cadres for the people's Laos.

The emissaries of Soviet communists visited the Museum of the Revolution, whose exhibits recreate important stages in the Lao peoples's struggle against colonialism and for national liberation and the building of a new life. The members of the delegation saw documents and materials describing the conception of the revolutionary movement in Laos and the development of the LPRP, the Lao working people's militant vanguard under whose leadership the foundations of socialist transformations are being laid in the country.

A warm meeting took place between the CPSU delegation and leaders and members of the Lao-Soviet Friendship Society aktiv. Welcoming the guests from the Soviet Union, Society Presidium Chairman Thongsavath (Nyamani) spoke about the work of this mass public organization which is doing much to strengthen friendship between the peoples of the two countries and to inform Laotians of the achievements by the Land of the Soviets.

G.A. Aliyev wished the society's members great successes in their noble work.

The delegation members toured Vientiane and saw monuments of the Lao people's centuries-old history and culture.

PRAVDA LINKS U.S. WITH PHILIPPINES 'DISCORD'

PM181513 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Nov 86 First Edition p 5

[Vsevolod Ovchinnikov article under the "Our Commentary" rubric: "Discord in Manila"]

[Text] Setting off recently for an official visit to Japan, President Aquino of the Philippines expressed the conviction that during her absence there would not be a coup d'etat in the country. Indeed, there was no coup. But such an unusual statement reflects the peculiarity of the situation in the Philippines.

Defense Minister Enrile's open attacks on the government and the president personally threaten to provoke a domestic political crisis. The military department head, who held that post under Marcos for many years, sharply opposed from the very beginning Aquino's decision to release political prisoners and to begin talks with the leaders of the insurgent movement, which has been in existence for 17 years now. Condemning the "conciliatory approach" toward the insurgents, he believes that the "communist threat" must be eliminated by force of arms.

In recent weeks Enrile has broadened the front of the attacks on the president. He has demanded that Aquino remove almost one-third of her cabinet members for their left-wing convictions. When the indignant ministers demanded Enrile's resignation he stated that since Aquino would not have become head of state without the support of the military they were entitled to consider themselves equal partners in the government coalition.

The discord in Manila became particularly aggravated after the publication of the draft new constitution, which will be submitted to a nationwide referendum. In addition to prohibiting the deployment of nuclear weapons in the Philippines, the draft envisages the holding of elections to the legislative and local organs of power in May next year as well as retaining the 6 year term of office of the present head of state. This provision, the press notes, hits the interests of the 62-year-old defense minister, who is dreaming of the presidency himself. Unwilling to wait until 1992, he is insisting on simulaneous municipal, parliamentary, and presidential elections next spring.

Enrile has repeatedly made many demands of that kind in public when addressing anticommunist rallies, where Marcos supporters gave him ovations as a "fighter for democracy and against the Red threat." But the matter does not center on Enrile alone, of course. He is backed by influential circles who fear that an investigation of the crimes committed by the ousted regime will threaten them, too. And they are backed by all those people who are frightened by the mere promise of reforms.

At this point mention should be of Washington. Generally speaking, it likes the present Philippines administration's liberal facade. As a decoy Washington pretends to disapprove of the defense minister's actions. However, if you recall the reproaches which Aquino heard just recently during her visits to the White House and Capitol Hill, you can see a striking similarity with Enrile's position. The U.S. "devotees of democracy" also oppose talks with the insurgents, also disapprove of the presence of the left-wing forces' representatives in the government, and object especially to the country's nonnuclear status, which would make the use of the U.S. military bases on Philippine soil difficult.

The conclusion is obvious: The situation in the Philippines is directly linked not only to the activity of internal reaction but also to the intrigues of U.S. ruling circles. While claiming to support stability in the Philippines they are pressuring Aquino via her political opponents so as to impose on her a course favorable to Washington.

ROMANIAN ENVOY, ION RECEIVED BY OFFICIALS

Holds Talks With Gromyko

LD211854 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 21 Nov 86

[Text] Today in the Kremlin Comrade Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, received Nicolae Ion, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Socialist Republic of Romania in the USSR.

During their friendly conversation satisfaction was expressed at the development of fruitful cooperation between the Soviet Union and Romania. The importance of the meetings and talks between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Nicolae Ceausescu, secretary general of the Romanian Communist Party, in further strengthening the multifaceted ties between the two countries was noted. The exceptional significance of the results of the working meeting held recently in Moscow of the leaders of the fraternal parties of the socialist member countries of the CEMA to bring socialism's creative potential more fully to light was emphasized. During the conversation they also discussed several problems of the contemporary international situation and bilateral Soviet-Romanian relations.

Received by Medvedev

LD222340 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1615 GMT 22 Nov 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received today Nicolae Ion, ambassador of the Socialist Republic of Romania to the USSR, and had a conversation with him which passed in a warm, comradely atmosphere.

KAPITONOV-LED DELEGATION DEPARTS FOR BUCHAREST

Seen Off by Medvedev

LD240735 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0720 GMT 24 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 24 Nov (TASS) -- A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet led by Deputy I.V. Kapitonov, chairman of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission, today left Moscow for an official friendly visit to Bucharest at the invitation of the Great National Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Romania.

At the airport the delegation was seen off by V.A. Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; V.S. Shevchenko, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; and other officials.

Arrives in Bucharest

LD241058 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1026 GMT 24 Nov 86

[Text] Bucharest, 24 Nov (TASS) -- A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation led by I.V. Kapitonov arrived here today on an official frendly visit at the invitation of the Grand National Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Romania.

The delegation was met at the airport by N. Giosan, candidate member of the Political Executive Committee of the RCP Central Committee, and chairman of the Romanian Grand National Assembly, Romanian Grand National Assembly deputies, and other officials. Ye. M. Tyazhelnikov, USSR ambassador to Romania, was also in the welcoming party.

VOROTNIKOV RECEIVES YUGOSLAV AMBASSADOR

LD220027 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 21 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Comrade Vorotnikov today received Veres, SFRY ambassador to the USSR. A friendly conversation was held, during which some issues of Soviet-Yugoslav cooperation were discussed.

BCP POLITBURO ASSESSMENT OF MOSCOW TALKS CITED

PM221435 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "To a Qualitatively New Level"]

[Text] Sofia, 15 Nov -- The Moscow working meeting of the leaders of the fraternal parties from the CEMA socialist countries reflects its partipants' shared desire to raise the relations of friendship, cooperation, and fraternal mutual assistance to a qualitatively new level, a report on a BCP Central Committee Politburo session published here says.

The quest for new forms to further expand and deepen integration processes and to reveal and utilize increasingly fully the creative potential and advantages of the socialist system occupied a special place at the meeting.

The transition of the fraternal countries' mutual relations to a qualitatively new level is exceptionally important at the present responsible and crucial stage in the development of productive forces dictated by the contemporary scientific and technical revolution. The implementation of this task will help to accelerate the CEMA countries' socioeconomic development, to raise their peoples' living standards, and to intensify the attraction of socialism.

The BCP Central Committee Politburo fully supports the Soviet Union's principled and constructive stance in Reykjavik, elaborated in line with the all-embracing program of the CPSU and the Soviet state for the strengthening of international security and coordinated with the foreign policy line of fraternal socialist countries. This stance enjoys the support of Bulgarian Communists and the entire Bulgarian people.

The Politburo unanimously approved the proposals made at the meeting by T. Zhivkov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian People's Republic State Council, aimed at the further development and improvement of all-around cooperation within the CEMA framework and relating to topical questions of the present-day international situation. The Politburo has instructed the relevant party, state, economic, and public organs and organizations to elaborate specific measures for the implementation of the accords reached at the Moscow meeting.

BULGARIAN ARMY POLTICAL CHIEF HONORED

PM181653 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Nov 86 Second Edition p 1

[USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree on the award of the Order of Friendship of the Peoples to Colonel General Mitko Mitkov, chief of the Main Political Directorate of the Bulgarian People's Army]

[Text] Colonel General Mitko Mitkov, chief of the Main Political Directorate of the Bulgarian People's Army, has been awarded the Order of the Friendship of the Peoples for services to strengthening the combat collaboration between the USSR Armed Forces and the Bulgarian People's Army and in connection with his 60th birthday.

A. Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
T. Mentešhashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
Moscow, Kremlin, 13 November 1986.

ALL-UNION AMITY WITH PPR MEETING HELD IN MOSCOW

LD222045 Warsaw Television Service in Polish 1830 GMT 21 Nov 86

[Text] We begin our foreign news with a dispatch from Moscow:

The sixth all-union conference of the Soviet-Polish Friendship Society held debates in Moscow today. Delegates from various republics of the Soviet Union, culture, and science activists, representatives of the workers, youth participated.

The report was read by Georgiy Beregavoy, the chairman of the Soviet-Polish Friendship Society. He assessed the activity of the society so far, discussed its participation in strengthening the traditional ties of friendship and direct contacts between the representatives of the two countries' peoples. A letter from the first secretary of the Polish PZPR Central Committee, Wojciech Jaruzelski, to the delegates of the All-Union conference was read out by Henryk Bednarski. The aims and goals expressed in the resolutions of the 10th PZPR Congress, wrote Wojciech Jaruzelski, intermingle and draw their inspiration from the progressive trend of socialism, so far-reachingly drawn during the 27th CPSU Congress. The socialist renewal of People's Poland is, in its essential being, convergent with the process of the deep restructuring which is taking place in the Soviet Union, stated the first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee.

The delegates sent a letter, containing sincere good wishes, to Wojciech Jaruzelski. The representatives of about 6 million members of the Soviet-Polish Friendship Society elected the central management of the society. Its new chairman is now Aleksandr Aksenov, member of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the State Committee for Radio and Television, and, until recently, the Soviet Union's ambassador to Poland.

JARUZELSKI DISCUSSES RELATIONS WITH USSR

For Warsaw PAP coverage of Gen. Wojciech Jaruzelski's interview given to the Finnish Daily HELSINGIN SANOMAT on 29 October, see the Poland section of the 18 November Eastern Europe DAILY REPORT.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON VISIT OF NETHERLANDS' LEADER

Received by Ryzhkov

LD201254 Moscow TASS in English 1235 GMT 20 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 20 TASS -- Today Prime Minister Rudolph Lubbers of the Netherlands and his wife arrived in Moscow on a visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

At the airport the prime minister was welcomed by Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and his wife as well as other officials.

The head of the Dutch Government is accompanied by Foreign Minister Hans van den Brock.

TASS: Shevardnadze Meets Minister

LD211335 Moscow TASS in English 1317 GMT 21 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 21 TASS -- Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, foreign minister of the USSR, today met Hans van den Broek, foreign minister of the Netherlands.

Both sides noted that the important Soviet-Dutch talks held in Moscow open up a new page in developing relations between the two countries in a variety of areas. From the point of view of deepening the political dialogue, the ministers discussed the most urgent issues of security in Europe and in the world and also some questions of bilateral relations.

Murakhovskiy Meets Businessmen

LD220535 Moscow TASS in English 1953 GMT 21 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 21 (TASS) -- Today Vsevolod Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Committee for the agri-industrial complex, received H. Wijffels, executive board chairman of the central cooperative bank Rabobank, and F. Sickinghe, board management chairman of the machine-building company, both from the Netherlands.

The sides had a detailed talk on issues of expanding and deepening various forms of cooperation in agriculture and processing of agricultural products. They discussed concrete proposals and projects, examined participation in them of several Soviet and Dutch organizations and firms, as well as some economic conditions of their interrelations in the agri-industrial complex.

ISRAELI ARMED FORCES PUT ON COMBAT ALERT

LD241041 Moscow TASS in English 1005 GMT 24 Nov 86

[Text] Cairo November 24 TASS -- Israeli Armed Forces were put on combat alert, the Egyptian newspaper SAWT AL-'ARAB reported today.

Additional armor and artillery units are being moved to the borders of that country.

According to the paper, Tel Aviv is getting ready to deliver a strike at Lebanese territory.

In this connection, it is noted in local political quaters that Israel notably scaled up its large-scale aggressive preparations after Israeli Prime Minister Shamir had returned from Washington.

U.S.-IRAN CONTACTS PURSUE 'BASE, SELFISH' MOTIVES

PM211507 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Nov 86 First Edition p 7

[Vitaliy Korionov "Commentator's Column": "But What Is Behind The 'Initiative'?"]

[Text] The political scandal in Washington due to the administration's secret actions in Iran is growing. Finding itself in the spotlight of international, including American public opinion, the ruling elite is bobbing and weaving in a frantic attempt to "save face." THE NEW YORK TIMES states that "in 25 years there has not been such a glut of statements expressing shock and embarrassment due to foreign policy surprises."

But the more the tangled web is unraveled, the more unpleasant the picture becomes as it is revealed to the world. From the numerous speeches that have been made by the President and other senior administration representatives, it becomes increasingly obvious how base, selfish, and contradictory to the interests of peace and the peoples' sovereignty are the motives of those who inspired Washington's "Iranian action." The motives stem entirely from the globalist designs of the ruling circles of the biggest imperialist power, which regards countries and peoples as pawns in its hegemonist policy.

The administration's true aims, as they emerge from the statements by its spokesmen once the demagogic rhetoric has been stripped away, are to secure the increasingly slender opportunity to control sources of Near East oil; to be able again to have a definite influence on Tehran's policy; to obtain new strategic military positions in the area; and finally, to continue the policy of prolonging the Iran-Iraq war.

"Iran occupies a geographical position which is in a sense one of the most important in the world. It is located between the Soviet Union and the approaches to the warm waters of the Indian Ocean" -- there is scarcely any need to comment on these words by R. Reagan. The Washington politicians' vision is so obscured by anti-Sovietism they have even gone so far as to claim that "America's long-standing aims in the region consist in helping Iran to remain independent of the Soviet Union."

What actually lurks behind thses fabrications certainly came out in the NBC television interview with Vice Admiral Poindexter, the President's national security adviser, the other day. He talked about Iran as if it were an American state. "There are three groupings in the Iranian Government," he said. And he casually announced: "Our definite aim is to support and encourage elements in the spectrum from moderates to conservatives, since the policy of the groupings is close to ours." Another Washington politician no less cynically added: "Arms supplies are a very effective 'lubricant' for opening any back door."

In a recent appearance the U.S. president admitted: "For 18 months now we have been conducting a secret diplomatic initiative toward Iran." It only remains for me to say that this "secret diplomatic initiative" has as little in common with the cause of peace in the Near East as the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative" has with the cause of world peace.

KHOMEYNI CRITICIZES REAGAN PRESS CONFERENCE

LD211018 Moscow TASS in English 0817 GMT 21 Nov 86

[Text] Nicosia November 21 TASS -- Commenting on U.S. President Ronald Reagan's remarks at a news conference on supplies of American arms to Tehran, the Iranian leader, Ayatollah Khomeyni, said Thursday that the abounding contradictions and confusion in Reagan's latest statements were hardly admissable to a head of state.

He added that the U.S. Administration was attempting "to cover up a major scandal" and that "the U.S. President should announce mourning following this disgrace, while the White House should turn black".

As quoted by IRNA news agency, Khomeyni also said in Tehran that former U.S. aide Robert McFarlane, who recently visited Iran on a secret mission, had been placed under house arrest, and denied a possibility to meet with Iranian officials, immediately after being identified.

The Iranian leader sharply criticized those Iranian circles which supported deals with the United States, and on behalf of the Iranian people he flatly rejected any possibility of relations with the United States being restored.

IRAQ'S RAMADAN RECEIVES FRIENDSHIP DELEGATION

PM191551 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Ties Strengthening"]

[Text] Baghdad, 17 Nov -- Iraqi First Deputy Prime Minister Taha Yasin Ramadan has received a visiting delegation from the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries headed by Ye.P. Kalenik, first deputy chairman of the Moldavian SSR Council of Ministers. During the conversation, emphasis was placed on the importance of broadening cooperation between public and professional organizations in the USSR and Iraq in order to further strengthen the friendly relations between the Soviet and Iraqi peoples.

HASENFUS CONVICTED, U.S. CONTINUES 'DIRTY WAR'

OW210557 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0255 GMT 18 Nov 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast; Aleksandr Yevdokimov commentary]

[Text] The trial of the American flyer Eugene Hasenfus ended in Managua. Our commentary follows:

[Yevdokimov] Hello comrades. Let me remind you that on 5 October a plane flown by Hasenfus and two other Americans was shot down by fighters of the Sandinist People's Army over the southern zone of Nicaragua.

On board the plane were weapons and equipment for the contras operating inside the country. Hasenfus, who survived and whose documents showed that he was a military adviser in El Salvador, was acused of terrorism, infringement on Nicaraguan security, and other crimes against the republic.

The trial went on for just over a month. Realizing the full implication of his position, Hasenfus began giving testimony that not only disheartened his defense, hired by the U.S. Embassy in Managua, but, as many observers have noted, left no loopholes for the strategists of the undeclared war against Nicaragua. He admitted that he was recruited by the U.S. CIA and had on many occasion participated in pirate raids into Nicaragua. The defendent also showed that the operation supplying the Contras is directed by Cuban counterrevolutionaries who have ties with officials in the Washington Administration, in particular, with Vice President Bush.

Thus, the direct involvement of the Reagan administration in the aggressive action against the Sandanist revolution has been revealed. The trial is over. Hasenfus has been sentenced to 30 years in prison. Washington's dirty war is continuing. It keeps on maintaining that Nicaragua is a threat to U.S. security. But if this question concerns the White House so much why is it not prepared to agree to normalization through diplomatic means? The Contadora Group and all progressive forces insist on this.

Our country, as was noted in the 16 November Soviet Government statement, is prepared in practical terms, to promote the formation of favorable conditions for a just political normalization in Central America.

NICARAGUAN SPOKESMAN PRAISES SUPPORT STATEMENT

LD221702 Moscow TASS in English 1228 GMT 22 Nov 86

[Text] Managua November 22 TASS -- The Soviet Government's statement on the Central American crisis in support of the fair cause in Nicaragua meets the aspirations of all of progressive mankind, Manuel Espinoza, press secretary at the Nicaraguan president's office, has said to TASS correspondent Aleksandr Trushin.

"This important and timely document," he emphasized, "was highly assessed by all peoples and governments who realize their responsibility for the maintenance of peace and insist on a political settlement in Central America."

The Soviet Union called again on the U.S. Administration to stop interference in Nicaragua's affairs and refrain from the escalation of aggression that was fraught with dangerous consequences for the Central American peoples.

The statement reaffirmed the USSR's constructive and responsible approach to the solution of key international problems, while Washington's interventionist course was meeting resistence of the peoples worldwide. "The international community demands that the U.S. ruling circles respect international norms and principles," Espinoza said.

NICARAGUAN ASSEMBLY ADOPTS NEW CONSTITUTION

LD191816 Moscow TASS in English 1249 GMT 19 Nov 86

[Text] Managua November 19 TASS -- TASS correspondent Aleksandr Trushin reports:

Nicaragua's National Assembly has approved the draft new constitution of the republic. The statement by president of the Nicaraguan Parliament Carlos Nunez that all the 202 articles of the fundamental law have been adopted were welcomed with a storm of applause by the deputies of the Sandinist National Liberation Front and six opposition parties, who participated in discussing the constitution.

The new constitution mirros the present-day situation of Nicaragua and the revolutionary process, through which the country is going. It seals the principles proclaimed by the Sandinist revolution of "political pluralism and mixed economy" in the home policy, and non-alignment -- in foreign policy. At the same time, the fundamental law, the first truly democratic one in Nicaragua's history has mirrored the revolutionary gains of the Nicaraguan people, the process of socio-economic reforms started after the revolution.

The working people have been granted the right of administration of the state and trade union democratic freedoms. From now on the Nicaraguan peasants are guaranteed by the constitution the right to land. The constitution also confirms Nicaragua's independent foreign policy and her solidarity with all peoples fighting for their national liberation. The republic, the constitution stresses, is committed to the principles of anti-imperialism, anti-colonialism and rejects racism and any forms of exploitation and oppression.

The adoption of the new draft constitution has been a major political victory for the Sandinist revolution. All the attempts of the USA at foiling the discussion of the draft constitution, making opposition parties withdraw from the National Assembly and instigating a crisis in it have failed.

The new constitution will become effective as of January next year.

PRESS CONFERENCE HELD ON SUPREME SOVIET SESSION

LD220407 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1835 GMT 21 Nov 86

[Report on 21 November press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists on the results of the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet by Nikolay Vladimirovich Talyzin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee; Boris Ivanovich Gostev, USSR Minister of finance; and Ivan Ivanovich Gladkiy, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, at the USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs -- recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] Dealing with the characteristics of the plan for the country's social and economic development in the second year of the 5-year plan, Comrade Talyzin said, in part:

[Talyzin] The first characteristic consists naturally, as you can understand, in that the plan is an inextricable part of the 5-year plan. None of the indices whatsoever are lower than the indicies of the whole 5-year plan. On the contrary, a whole number of sections -- the social section, for example -- show indices that are considerably higher than the indices of the 5-year plan. A most important feature of the plan is, or consists in, the fact that it consolidates and develops the positive processes taking place in the economy and society in accordance with the decisions of the 27th congress of our party. Increasing emphasis is being placed on the acceleration of scientific and technological progress, the equipping of the main branches of industry in general on the bais of scientific achievements, and the modernization and reconstruction of the industrial potential. On this basis emphasis is placed on the achievement, so to speak, of an ever faster pace of growth. We also see great possibilities in the area of the improvement of the structure of production and the improvement of the quality of products. Also, great attention is naturally being paid to the revitalization of social policy. Furthermore, the economic mechanism, including also planning, of course, is being actively -- and I would say -- very energetically restructured. The system of planning itself and the composition of the plan, and so on, is being radically restructured. From the beginning of next year industry as a whole, all the industrial ministries, the agro-industrial complex, transport, communications, and consumer services will be working under economic management conditions. Several industrial ministries and also a whole number of others will be working on the principles of full financial autonomy, self-financing, and self-recouping. In 1987 a transfer to long-term, stable economic norms as a basis for the interrelations between the state and an enterprise will be implemented everywhere. Collectives that are operating successfully and earning more funds for the enterprises will be given greater opportunities for technological re-equipping and for material incentives for the workers through appropriate and for material incentives for the workers through appropriate funds and for the solution of social questions. These are in essence the levers which combine centralized planning, the interests of the state, and the interests of an enterprise.

The next feature: The main indicator of the activities of industrial associations and enterprises will be the index of the 100 percent fulfillment of the contractual pledges. Another question raised by the plan is the question of improving the quality of products. It will not be necessary to produce in such great amounts if quality is high. And another most important section is the social section of the plan which has been so extensively developed for the first time. This section embraces all the following spheres: an increase in the production of consumer goods, the broad development of the services sector, and improving people's well-being. Three quarters of the growth of the national income is being spent on the improvement of the social sphere of people's lives.

We could never dream of such a great volume of housing construction, schools, preschool establishments, hospitals, polyclinics, culture establishments, and so on. The construction of 126 million square meters of housing is being planned for next year. This is 16 million more than has been annually introduced, and this is equal to a city of 1 million inhabitants. There will be no problems with kindergartens by the end of this 5-year plan. These are the special features of the plan.

[Announcer] The floor was then given to Boris Ivanovich Gostev, the USSR minister of finance.

[Gostev] The first thing is that in the budget we are allocating substantial funds to the development of the economy. All the investments in the sphere of the economy will amount to more than R450 billion. One of the features of the budget is that it is oriented to a greater degree toward enhancing the efficiency of the economy. This is confirmed, among other things, in the financial figures. On one hand, large funds are being put into the development of the economy, and on the other provision is made for large sources of gaining income from the economy, chiefly by improving the efficiency of public-sector production. In this way, profit will increase by 9 percent during the year. The second thing that can be noted is that the state budget is oriented toward the new economic mechanism, which has already been mentioned. Third, a firm financial base is being created for improving the well-being of the people. For all the needs of the population, including housing and development of the public catering and services spheres, a total of R380 billion is being allocated in the budget, which is R20 billion more than this year. The last thing I woulds like to note is that, as in any sovereign state, and particularly since ours is the first state of workers and peasants, there is also the function of defending the state. To these ends also specific funds are provided for in the state budget. Those are roughly the chief aims of our budget.

[Announcer] Ivan Ivanovich Gladkiy, chairman of the State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, then spoke.

[Gladkiy] At the USSR Supreme Soviet session, as you know, a law was passed on individual labor activity. What I would like to note first of all is that this new law is aimed at making fuller use of our country's labor resources, developing initiative, and enabling citizens to have a greater interest in socially useful labor. It is envisaged that individual labor activity itself will be used primarily to achieve what I would say are three chief goals. First, there is the goal of more fully meeting public requirements for goods and service -- first and foremost in those cases where it is particularly important to satisfy citizens' individual tastes -- by the broader development of business undertakings by groups of people and craftsmen. Second, increasing the employment of citzens in useful public labor. I can tell you by way of example that in our country today there are 56 million pensioners, 10 million of whom work in public-sector production, who have high qualifications and are in good enough health to continue some sort of labor activity, especially individual labor activity; and there are many housewives and other citizens who, for one reason or another, are unable to participate in public-sector production. These includes people in poor health -- invalids and so on -- but they could engage in some sort of individual labor activity. Finally, individually labor activity enables citizens to obtain additional income in accordance with the labor they perform. Moreover, the USSR Constitution permits individual labor activity, so the law passed at the recent Supreme Soviet session is in full accordance with the USSR Constitution. If one is to speak of the principles on which the law is based, then what I would say is that the state is making provision for individual labor activity to be used first and foremost in the interests of society. Second, all limitations on engaging in types of individual labor activity useful to society are removed.

And third, the development of individual labor activity is regulated by means of the tax system. This system will ensure that every citizen engaging in individual labor activity has an interest in working, and at the same time the tax system will provide some small income for the state. Last, the local soviets are being given broad rights in regulating individual labor activity. If you have read the law, you will have noticed that a number of only the basic types of individual labor activity that may be engaged in are listed. Very broad rights, however, are being given to the soviets of people's deputies in the localities. They have a better idea of what is needed in the region and what are the national peculiarities: After all, from Moscow it's impossible to make provision for everything that has to be done in the localities, taking into account the natioal peculiarities, the need to satisfy more fully a particular demand, be it for goods or for services, and so forth. That is why rights have been granted for questions about engaging in individual labor activity to be solved in the actual localities. Finally, what I would like to say is that the gentlemen journalists asked me after the Supreme Soviet session in the Georgiyevskiy Hall whether this was not entrepreneurial activity, or private entrepreneurial activity, and so on. I want to tell you clearly that this is not private entrepreneurial activity. This is individual labor activity in which hired labor and the exploitation of man by man is categorically with individual labor activity. Thank you.

[Talyzin] Now we can go over to the questions.

[Correspondent] (?Kubachi), of Japanese television NHK. When the law comes into force, what percentage of the national income will individual labor activity comprise?

[Gladkiy] According to the calculations of the State Committee for Labor -- and this was the figure that I gave at the session -- More than 100,000 people in our country are small-scale tradesmen. Next year we project that there will be something like 2-3 million people engaged in individual labor activity. You, of course, are interested in what this percentage will be in the national income. It is difficult to say, but it will not be more than 1 percent. It will be something like 0.1 or perhaps 0.5 percent, but I am ever afraid to say that this will be the actual figure.

[Correspondent] Joszef Barath, of Hungarian radio. What is the tendency in the USSR state debt?

[Gostev] The tendency is like this: On one hand we are in debt to other states, but on the other hand they are in debt to us. So the only thing I can reply is that our activity here is normal and completely balanced. In other words, the amounts that we take in credit and the amounts that we given in credit are balanced.

[Talyzin] Here is a written question from its Japanese newspaper ASAHI, in which the correspondent asks how the reduction in income from sales of alcholic beverages has affected our budget.

[Gostev] I can say that it has had an effect, of course. That is to say that the total tax on turnover amounts to 22 percent of revenue. Our basic revenue comes from the national economy, as in any other developed state, from industry, agriculture, and construction. And second, I can say that one-third of our tax on turnover use to consist of revenue from wines and liquor. Now their share has fallen to one quarter. But this fall has been covered by above-plan returns in the state revenue, from the profits of the national economy. A figure was named during the session: R3.5 billion rubles. It was partly made up for -- you know this, we do not conceal it -- by price increases for wines and liquor.

[Talyzin] In addition to that, Boris Ivanovich, I would say that we have exerted ourselves somewhat, and started producing considerably more consumer goods and services. Previously we had some shortages of, for example, building materials. Now we have made provision for so much building material that the population can fully meet its needs.

[Correspondent] Salamah, from Egypt. I return to the theme of the law on individual labor. Will the state not suffer some loss in the area of domestic services because of this law, and will it not necessitate pay raises for the working people?

[Gladkiy] The state will suffer no damage, because individual labor activity in the sphere of services will amount to a very small volume. There will be no damage to the state. I believe that at present the state can gain something: first, because the citizens will engage in individual labor activity and earn additional income, and the state will have a certain revenue from the tax on individual labor activity. From the view point of the citizen, of course, if he is working privately, having some small private job while working in the public sector, then of course he will work so as to earn a bit of money, won't he? Because he must have some material interest. For him it will be an additional source of income.

[Talyzin] Here is another question, from NOVOSTI: Why does the law not include the sphere of public catering? Is any extension of the effect of the law possible?

[Gladkiy] We deliberately did not include in this law the sphere of public catering because from Moscow it is not possible to regulate everything that has to be done at the local level. We granted this right to the union republic councils of ministers, and the local soviets of people's deputies. They are empowered... There is a broad range for granting permission... They are empowered to grant permission, and to decide what to organize and where.

[Correspondent, in English with superimposed Russian translation] Mike Davidow, PEOPLE'S DAILY WORLD, United States. A comparison is being drawn between the individual labor activity law and the new economic policy of the twenties. Could you comment on this? And second, do you envisage any problems that might arise in the period up to May in laying the appropriate organizational foundations? Those are my two questions.

[Gladkiy] I would like to reply to that question in this way: What is the difference between the present individual labor activity and the new economic policy of the twenties? First of all, the new economic policy of the twenties provided for private enterprise. A citizen, or group of citizens, could hire manpower, hired labor, with consequent exploitation of man by man. Now this is categorically forbidden -- private enterprise activity, with hired manpower, to say nothing, of course, of exploitation of man by man. That is the fundamental difference between the new economic policy and the present law on individual labor activity. That's the first thing. Second, you asked what we are going to do between now and May. In the first place we have to draft the patents, and decide what sort of taxation system there will be, and certification, and corresponding normative acts. That is why the launch is planned for May, to give us time to prepare, at both the central and the local level, the issue of the appropriate normative documents for the correct application of individual labor activity.

[Correspondent] HUNGARIAN TELEGRAPH AGENCY. Ivan Ivanvoich, basically the law permits individual labor activity in one's spare time. In what conditions may a person engage exclusively in such activity, and is it not feared that some people will, as it were, seek formal jobs, so as to have a formal job on paper, and then engage in individual labor?

[Gladkiy] This is a natural question. One should not avoid it. But of course first of all we cannot say taht we are 100 percent confident that somebody will not leave his job in public sector production for individual labor activity. One cannot vouch for all 270 million. But we suppose that this will not happen. Why? Because when one is involved in individual labor activities one can only earn some income for himself from his personal labor and live on it. If he leaves public sector production, then first he loses his official record of his work experience, he loses his pay, he loses all his benefits that deal with pension, social security, leave and so on, that is, all the benefits working people in the various areas of public sector production enjoy. It is, therefore, unlikely that one will benefit from leaving public sector production. This is a reply to the first part of your question. As far as the second part is concerned, this is possible, of course. We know that among our friends there was a tendency in certain quarters for citizens to switch to an easier job of some kind and then after their working day to put in some very hard work and make several times more than they did for their day's work in public sector production. Such a tendency is a possibility. But at any rate we hope that we shall be able to regulate it.

[Correspondent] Stefan Simak, Czechoslovak radio correspondent. To what extent did the Soviet planning bodies consider the implementation of the integrated program for the scientific and technical progress of the CEMA member-countries in drawing up the state plan for 1987? What specific results can be expected from this program this year?

[Talyzin] As far as the Soviet Union and its economy are concerned, our Soviet state plan -- and I think this is the case in all countries -- this is what we, the chairmen of the planning committees, agreed -- has a special section devoted to the integrated program for the scientific and technical progress of the CEMA member-countries to the year 2000. Under 1987 we included for implementation more than 200 of the biggest development projects we shall be introducing into industry as a result of joint scientific work.

[Correspondent] Terekhov, Moscow Radio. The plan for the first time poses the question of social problems so pointedly and broadly. Could you give some of the main characteristics of the 1987 social progress program in this context?

[Talyzin] Well, take the bringing into use of housing. In the 1987 figure will be 126 million square meters. Over the 5-year plan, it will be 620-630 million square meters. This figure gives a guarantee -- we have calculations that show this -- that we shall solve the housing problem in the Soviet Union by 1995-97. There will also be a vast increase in schools, and we shall bring hospitals and out-patients clinics to the norms set per 1,000 or 10,000 people in a year or two. The second matter here is the very major and important one of radically increasing the quality of work, the quality of services. Enormous sums are allocated in the budget for the pay raises of certain categories of working people -- doctors, education workers -- and for a whole number of other benefits. Next year the average monthly pay of working people will be more than R200, and in agriculture it will by R164. This is even considerably higher than the figures in the 5-year plan; it is increasing a little bit faster. Payments from social funds are also growing faster than laid down in the 5-year plan. In our country social consumption funds pay out a very large amount per person.

[Announcer] Comrades Talyzin, Gostev, and Gladkiy also gave replies to other questions of the press conference participants.

TASS ANALYST EXAMINES INDIVIDUAL LABOR LAW

LD211905 Moscow TASS in English 1622 GMT 21 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 21 TASS -- TASS news analyst Boris Prokhorov writes:

It was pointed out in the report on the draft law on individual labour, which was adopted by the Soviet parliament this week, that the draft law had been prepared on the strength of a thorough analysis of public opinion.

This is far from being the only example of a quick reaction by the country's leading bodies to the opinion of the public. This is one of the characteristic features of present-day reality in the Soviet Union.

In the first half of this year newspapers had written a good deal, for example, about the imperfection of the country's labour remuneration system which had practically equalised earning possibilities for both people who strove to work more and better, and for those who preferred not trouble themselves much.

This had been also stated in full voice at workers' meetings. A new system of the remuneration of labour in the production sphere is introduced in the USSR from January 1, next year. It will cover 75 million people. The essence of the new remuneration system is that the amounts of earnings will now depend to a greater extent on the quanity and quality of everyone's work. In a large degree, this is resultant of the public action.

Readers' letters, articles by scientists and public figures had been published in our press repeatedly. They strongly criticized the USSR State Committee for the Material and Technical Supply for insufficient attention to the utilisation of household and industrial wastes, for sluggishness in collecting and processing them.

A resolution of the Government of the USSR on setting up cooperatives for the gathering and processing secondary raw materials was issued recently on the committee's initiative as if in response to the criticisms.

A government decision to discontinue work on a transfer of part of the discharge of the northern rivers to the country's southern areas was issued last summer.

The preparation for such a transfer had been started several years ago without sufficient study of possible ecological and other consequences of such a step.

Scientists and the public at large came out with the well-rounded protests against the transfer of river waters. People's opinion has prevailed over departmental interests, although quite considerable funds had already been spent on the effort.

The recent measures aimed at improving the activities of the houses of culture and at setting up youth interest clubs, and other measures may be regarded as concrete responses to the wishes of the public.

An exhibition of competitive projects for the main monument of the memorial commemorating the Soviet people's victory in the Second World War is to open in Moscow in less than two months' time.

It must be recalled that the previous project which had at one time been adopted without a broad public discussion and was being already embodied in metal and granite was considered an unhappy one.

Artists and residents of the capital opposed it in speeches at meetings and session, in newspapers articles and in radio broadcasts.

As a result, the construction of the memorial was suspended, and a new competition for the main monument was announced. The Muscovites will be able to get acquainted with the results of the competition early next year.

Putting it in a nutshell, the present-day life in the Soviet Union provides quite a number of examples which are illustrative of the growth of the prestige of public opinion in this country, and of the rise in its role in the solution of important matters.

Academician on Law

LD230419 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 22 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast: talk by Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin, director of the Institute of Economics of the USSR Academy of Sciences and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Text] What needs to be said about this law? Its adoption comes as no surprise -- it is not a sudden development. When the present USSR Constitution was adopted, it included a special section permitting individual labor in appropriate spheres. In the time that has elapsed since the adoption of the Constitution, a certain amount of experience has been amassed; we have made a careful study of what was available in our past history, studied the experiences of the fraternal countries of socialism, and assessed the possible consequences, and the result is that his law has now been passed. It is directed toward solving a number of problems that we encounter today. The situation is this: On one hand, we really do experience a serious need for a whole range of consumer goods and services which is, at times, not easy to satisfy; and on the other hand, people have the ability to offer something marketable,to apply their labor in the common cause, for the good, after all, of each one of us. It was necessary to find forms in which to solve this problem. We live at a time when we are not infrequently come across solutions that break the tradition. I can give you several examples:

In the autumn of this year, fairs were held in many of our towns -- and in many cases they were a great success -- for the sale of the produce of our fields and farms. They were popular with the city-dwellers and got off to a good start; this is a sphere in which bold and interesting forms have been found.

Now, along with extensive production of consumer goods and improvement of their quality, we have gone further and decided to set up a specialized network of shops to sell especially fashionable articles in strong demand. These are goods that are sold at high prices, the proceeds of which go not to the specualative second-hand dealer, but to the state.

In discussing the law on individual labor, one cannot separate it from the recent law to combat nonlabor income -- a struggle that has not ceased, and never will.

What remains to be said? We must understand that it is not the forms themselves that matter, but the content. The socialist nature of these forms of individual labor is determined by the fact that they are done and carried out in the interests of society. All forms of possibilities of using the labor of others, hired labor, are excluded. This is being done under the supervision of all the local bodies of our state. I would like to remind you of what Lenin said in his work", Left Wing Communism -- An Infantile Disorder." He wrote that socialist construction can and must manifest itself in every form, both new and old. It can and must regenerate, vanquish, and subordinate to itself all forms, not only the new, but also the old. Then follow these very characteristic words: Not in order to reconcile ourselves with the old, but in order to able to make all new and old forms of every kind into an instrument of the full, final, decisive, and irreversible victory of communism.

PRAVDA'S AFANASYEV ANSWERS QUESTIONS ON REFORM

LD230219 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1620 GMT 22 Nov 86

[Program entitled "Academician Afanasyev Answers Readers' Letters," in which PRAVDA Chief Editor V.G. Afanasyev replies to letters from readers]

[Excerpts] Hello, comrade TV viewers! Today we again hold our conversation, our talk with you with replies to your questions. [passage omitted]

Soviet man is not without sin, if I can put it that way. We still find quite a few manifestations alien to ideology and morals; there are quite a few social -- or to put it more accurately, antisocial phenomena. They are: violations of labor discipline, theft, bribery, speculation, parasitism, manifestations of private-ownership psychology, money-grubbing, toadyism, and servility. All this is dealt with in the new edition of our party program. We have quite a few letters about them, these antisocial phenomena, these slants, as it were, these antisocial properties. People are indignant: they are proposing ways and means to fight these antisocial phenomena, they are hurrying us to fight them more quickly and resolutely -- even phenomena such as hooliganism, drunkenness and alcoholism, and nonlabor income. And the party is doing this.

There are letters like these -- here is one of them: Pavel Ivanovich Timoshenko, from Riga, writes: That a material-technical supply base, without which not everyone will receive according to his requirements, is essential for building communism is not questioned by anybody. However, alongside this one should radically break down narrow views of the world, especially among the members of our socialist society who think that money is everything, and that everything is money.

Our TV viewers, the authors of these letters, resolutely demand that these views be broken down, and that they be broken down in the most resolute, and, at times, the most merciless manner. The party is breaking down these views. The party is educating people, it is transforming their consciousness. This is particularly important now, when we have embarked on the path of acceleration, the path of restructuring all spheres of our public life. You of course know that recently our party's Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers adopted a resolution on fighting nonlabor incomes. A very great and difficult and, I would say, in a certain sense, a painful restructuring of the wages system, which affects, or will affect, to put it more accurately, many, many millions of our people is starting. What is the point of the reform, of the deep reform of our wages system?

The main point is that the ruble should be nonderivable, and not guaranteed regardless of the quantity and quality of labor of each person; that is should indeed be truly earned. In the course of this, the wages of a significant part of our Soviet people -- again, we're talking about many millions -- will be significantly increased, but not through state subsidies, not through the state budget, but through individual labor and through an increase in productivity. Wages will be made directly dependent on the worker's qualifications, the quality of his work, his activity and his labor output.

At this moment, writes Petr Ivanovich Timoshenko of Riga, the fight against alcoholism and nonlabor income has already begun. This is a good start, but shouldn't some sort of reform also be carried out in relation to the monetary system as well? Perhaps if you poured out a smaller sum, it would have the psychological effect of moderating to a certain extent the appetities of those who like money.

Another letter: I have decided to write to you, writes Leonid Mikhaylovich Vedyakin from the town of Khartsyzsk in Donetsk Oblast. I am writing for the first time. If it is possible, could you reply to the following question: Why not carry out a monetary reform in our country now on the model of the one in 1947 and could you cite as examples one or two important factors of why it cannot be carried out?

You know, speaking frankly, I also nurtured this idea at one time, and I also have been, to put it frankly, a champion of monetary reform. I thought that this reform could be implemented not like in 1947, but simply by changing our banknotes on a one-to-one basis. It seemed to me that this would be sufficient to make people afraid to hand in surplus money of a nonlabor nature, stolen or acquired by any other dishonest means, to go to savings banks or banks, so that, by the same token, a significant part of this nonlabor money would removed from our money circulation.

But then I thought for a while and sought advice. I sought advice from our financiers. I spoke in particular with USSR State Bank Chairman Viktor Vladimirovich Dementsev, and we came to the conclusion that it is impossible to carry out a reform, even a one-to-one reform. It will be ineffective and may even be harmful to some extent, perhaps even dangerous. Let's say, in one town or the other -- take Moscow, there are dozens and dozens of savings banks here -- any underground millionaire, so to speak, can stop in at all these savings banks and change money in insignificant sums and, of course, he can entrust somebody with changing this money, for a certain recompense, so to speak.

That's not all there is to it. Any rumor of a reform even will cause undesirable occurrences: People will go around stores, buy up everything; various rumors will spread, which is extremely undesirable. Obviously, at this point in time at any rate, there is no talk of a reform. These rumors -- and there are these rumors that there will be a reform, that there will be a rise in prices on this, that, or the other -- are without any foundation whatsoever.

Next, much is said abut our people's moral qualities. Apart from nonlabor income, a point is made about other antisocial occurrences, and some of our readers, I would say, reach excessively generalized conclusions. Thus, Ivan Ivanovich Petrov, from the town of Rostov, asks: Why is it that for our people -- not for all, but for many -- ideology has increasingly deteriorated? The rule of law and moral norms is being violated; moreover, some people are embarking on the path of crime. Why do some of our people, he writes, have such a low level of ideology -- including managers of enterprises and institutions and people higher up?

Indeed, this sort of phenomenon does exist, although one can by no means agree that our people's ideology is increasingly deteriorating. I have already said that a significant part of our people, Soviet people, have a lofty consciousness, a socialist consciousness, they are working to the extent of their creative potentialities and capabilities. They live on the money they have earned themselves. But antisocial phenomena do exist, and as I have already said, this cannot fail to worry us. What are the reasons for it? Well, one of the reasons is that our Soviet socialist society grew out of the depths of capitalism, and although decades have already gone by -- soon it will be 70 years since the day of the Great October Socialist Revolution -- nevertheless remnants of the past remain. People's psychology, their consciousness is fairly conservative, they don't always keep pace with the development of reality, with events, and it is natural that these phenomena of the past, remnants of the past, as we say, as we call them, also occur in our society, and will seemingly go on occurring for some time to come. But it one puts it down just to remnants then we won't explain antisocial phenomena. We have young people, and middle-aged people who are far removed from the source of this capitalism and its morals and norms. Nevertheless, they do not behave as they should in our society. What is the matter here? Here, in the main, it is a matter of a shortcoming in our practical work in the most varied spheres of public life. This, as was said at the 27th Party congress, causes a delay in solving our urgent problems. One of the important causes here is the shortcomings in our education, the formalism that still occurs; this bulk, overall approach to education issues; the absence of a differentiated, ideal approach; shortcomings in education in the family, work at the school, and the work of the collective. And in talking about these causes, acknowledging them, so to speak, in one form or the other, and in diverse variations, if one may put it that way, our viewers quite resolutely demand that they be fought, that they be fought mercilessly.

For example, Comrade Yu. D. Sukhanov writes -- those are this initials; he hasn't given his name and patronymic -- that people must be untaught the antisocialist vileness which has eaten into their consciousness, which corrupts man's soul, the self-seeking and shamelessness. The question arises: How does one fight it? Here the range of views is very, very great. From, so to speak, exhortation and persuasion to the most decisive measures. The proposals go right up to taking a sabre to this antisocial phenomenon, this evil. [passage omitted]

But, nevertheless, it is impossible to stop antisocial phenomena with the sabre or with the most ruthless measures. Some of our readers propose setting up something like a workers' guard that would stroll through all the places where there is thieving, trading, and bribery, the shops and canteens where these phenomena occur. I don't think that this is a way out either. The way out, in general, lies elsewhere, and the materials of our 27th party congress have expressed rightly a way of overcoming antisocial phenomena, or ways, to put it more accurately, of overcoming antisocial phenomena. The most important thing is to eliminate shortcomings, to solve urgent problems in good time, to tell people the truth; it is broad openness, it is active educational work -- and the important thing in this educational work should be unity of word and deed -- which as yet we are finding far from everywhere. It is an individual approach to people, regardless of who they are -- exemplary citizens, or violators of our laws and morals. It is a question of fighting with the force of the law, the force of public opinion. A great role and great value, of course, can and must be played here by our press, radio, television, newspapers, magazines, literature, and art. [passage omitted]